9-26-1996

Positional Leaders in Minneapolis Neighborhood Groups

Stephanie Anne Anderson
Augsburg College

Positional Leaders in Minneapolis Neighborhood Groups

Submitted in partial requirement for the degree of
Master of Arts in Leadership

Augsburg College
Minneapolis, Minnesota

by Stephanie Anne Anderson
December 1996

Master of Arts in Leadership
Augsburg College
Minneapolis, Minnesota

Certificate of Approval

This is to certify that the master's thesis of Stephanie Anne Anderson has been approved by the Review Committee for the thesis requirement for the Master of Arts in Leadership degree.

Date of Oral Defense: 9/26/96

Committee Advisor: _____

_____
Reader

_____
Reader

Final Thesis Revision Approval

Student's Name: Stephanie Anne Anderson

Title: Positional Leaders in Minneapolis Neighborhood Organizations

The student named above has passed her oral defense and made all required revisions to my satisfaction on her thesis as required for the thesis component of the Master of Arts in Leadership degree.

Furthermore, this thesis involved human subjects, therefore the research was approved by IRB.

Signature of Advisor

Dec 16, 1996
Date

Acknowledgments

I would like to thank Garry Hesser, my thesis advisor, for his useful advice and generous encouragement.

I also want to acknowledge Betty VandeLaare, a coworker, whose gentle probing got me back to work and whose computer skills turned my primitive survey into a presentable document. A former coworker, Julie Jurchisin, was instrumental in making my work possible by showing me her previous SPSS project and by suggesting a format for data entry.

Thanks go as well to my best friend, Tracy Embretson, for listening to my experiences during this project, for expressing faith that I was capable enough to do it, and for her invaluable and patient aid in untangling and teaching me the mysteries of SPSS and the Augsburg computer system as well as how to conquer my own personal computer. She has my gratitude in addition to my love.

I also want to thank my husband, Mike Anderson. His continuing challenges and high expectations, whether real or imagined, motivated me to finish my thesis so I could complete my degree. Throughout this experience, he was always available to review my work, make suggestions, offer encouragement, and share his substantial expertise.

Finally, I would like to thank my parents, Beverly and Robert Bruce Peterson, for instilling in me a strong work ethic, a love of learning, and an appreciation for a liberal education. They provided me with the tools and confidence to attempt projects such as this.

Abstract

Leaders in 72 neighborhood groups recognized by the Minneapolis Community Development Agency were surveyed to test four hypotheses. Neighborhood leaders were expected to be white, middle or upper-income, college graduate, homeowning, women and not representative of Minneapolis residents. This proved valid except the number of men and women was equal. Respondents were expected to have become and stayed involved in their group over concern for property values and safety; this was partially true, other reasons were given. Neighborhood leaders were expected to report concern over the time needed for their group and to list burnout as the main reason they would leave; this was validated. It was predicted neighborhood groups would not have active training programs, that few individuals participated in training, and that this was a concern. This proved valid although neighborhood leaders might not consciously associate lack of training with their group's problems.

Table of Contents

Introduction

Citizen involvement is a U. S. government principle which congress reaffirmed in the late 1960s with legislation mandating public input on publicly-funded projects. In the 1970s, formal citizen organizations were called upon to review local government programs and to provide feedback. In the 1990s, as the federal government seeks to reduce its involvement and spending in state and local affairs, citizen organizations are not only called upon to identify issues and needs in their areas, but, in some cases, to organize, finance, and deliver services.

In Minneapolis, "the Minneapolis Community Development Agency (MCDA) seeks to sustain and improve the residential, economic and aesthetic environment of the City for the benefit of residents, employees and businesses . . ." (MCDA, 1996). At all stages in its activities, the MCDA is required to provide a means for the direct involvement of citizens. To meet this requirement, the MCDA has identified Minneapolis neighborhood groups as the conduit for citizen participation. Annually, neighborhood groups contract with the MCDA to deliver citizen participation services to their area; in return, neighborhood groups receive public recognition and funding (MCDA).

In its 1996 directory, the MCDA lists 72 neighborhood groups. Typically, a board of directors, elected from citizens who either live or work in the neighborhood, oversee these groups. Under the terms of their Citizen Participation contract with the MCDA,

these board members have several responsibilities which include holding regular meetings to share information about city programs, soliciting public comment which represents the interests of all segments of their neighborhoods, building a sense of community in their geographic area, expanding membership, and developing new leadership. Additionally, group members must manage budgets, adopt by-laws and grievance procedures, hold elections, perform self-assessments, evaluate the group's process and activities, and, in some cases, supervise steering committees, volunteer staff, and employees (MCDA, 1995). These are significant responsibilities requiring a variety of skills and commitment.

While there is substantial information on citizen groups, volunteer organizations, professional organizers, and city programs, there is little information on these neighborhood "leaders." We don't know who they are demographically, or if they are truly representative of Minneapolis residents. We don't know what motivated them to become involved, or what keeps them involved. We don't know what they think their role is, or what they actually do. And we don't know what training they have, or if they have a need for additional support.

Answers to these questions are important to communities and to the study of leadership because they may provide information on how to attract citizens and keep them involved in public policy and program implementation. They may point to training which should be provided to keep neighborhood groups from getting bogged down in administrative

details and unable to move on to community-building responsibilities. Further, having more information about these leaders, their interests, and abilities might give rise to ideas which cut costs, reduce duplication of efforts, and lead to a sharing of resources.

Problem Statement

This research proposes to be exploratory with both qualitative and quantitative analysis of selected demographic and attitudinal characteristics of people in leadership positions within the 72 Minneapolis neighborhood organizations recognized by the MCDA in their 1996 directory. Here, leadership positions refer to the position of President or Chair, Vice-President or Co-Chair, Treasurer, Secretary, Committee Chair, board member, or some similar position within a Minneapolis neighborhood organization.

One purpose of this spring 1996 study is to analyze the findings in comparison with 1990 Minneapolis census data to determine if respondents are representative of the general population of Minneapolis in gender, race, income, and education or if any groups are over or under-represented. If neighborhood groups are not representative, their abilities to recognize and understand today's complex issues and to speak for their whole community might be questioned.

An analysis of reported attitudes toward neighborhood organizations and of respondents' histories with their groups will be made to identify whether these neighborhood leaders share a similar profile. This information may be useful in learning how to attract and keep more individuals involved in their community groups.

Information about respondents' experiences and the way they report time spent in relation to their neighborhood organizations will be reviewed to determine if special training would be useful for these leaders. If training appears appropriate, topic areas may be uncovered.

Delimitations

This research will not attempt to create a statistical picture of the entire population of Minneapolis neighborhood leaders. There are neighborhood organizations not listed in the MCDA directory and there was a substantial population of leaders within the groups contacted who chose not to participate. It will be unclear if this research provides adequate citywide statistics on the neighborhood groups surveyed as confidentiality issues prevented identifying the surveys returned by neighborhood group or by the part of the city in which the respondent lived.

This research will not attempt to review or judge the content of existing neighborhood training programs and resources, the work of individual neighborhoods, or of individual leaders. Nor will it attempt to review or judge the MCDA or other city agencies.

This research is not a review or analysis of the Neighborhood Revitalization Program (NRP) currently in place in Minneapolis, although the NRP will be mentioned in the body

of this work.

Assumptions

This research makes several assumptions. First, that community organizations in Minneapolis will continue to play an important role in local politics and that this places value on learning more about the individuals who comprise neighborhood organization leadership. Second, that respondents would be honest in reporting their demographics and attitudes, and that conclusions and recommendations might be formed from their responses.

Disclosure

It seems appropriate, at this time, to acknowledge the researcher's prior and continuing relationship with the Windom Park neighborhood in Minneapolis. For several years, the researcher has been active in that group and has held the positions of committee cochair, Treasurer, and Vice-President. An attempt has been made throughout this study to identify and eliminate personal bias associated with these previous experiences. For instance, many survey questions were open-ended instead of multiple-choice to allow respondents to create their own answers instead of being led into categories preselected by the researcher. Additionally, the researcher intended to disclose this relationship in the

cover letter sent to each survey participant, however, the Augsburg Institutional Review Board believed it would be better not to note the relationship as it might have undue influence on respondents.

Review of Related Literature

Creating Cities and Developing Neighborhoods

The concept that people live in neighborhoods within a city is an old one. Konvitz (1985) explained that people historically built their homes close together, often near natural resources. In the middle ages, living near each other brought protection from outsiders and offered advantages such as the ability to barter for goods and services which encouraged the development of new jobs and technologies.

Forming cities brought improvements to individuals and their families, but this type of living also brought problems and the need for change and government intervention. "Eventually improvements in the public interest were rationalized with cost benefits concepts which appeared to be in the economic interests of everyone....Fire insurance, building codes, fire departments, improved water distribution and sewage disposal systems...were applied throughout the city, even though such improvements imposed constraints on profit-oriented city builders" (Konvitz, 1985, p.xix).

Banerjee & Baer (1984) note the concept of "neighborhood" was represented as early as 443 b.c. in the new plan of Thurium. The plan used four vertical and three horizontal arteries to create ten neighborhood units, each assigned to a particular tribe. In the 1920s,

city planners used the idea of neighborhood to develop concrete models which specified population, physical arrangement of residences and surrounding streets, and supporting facilities. Specific care was taken to separate land uses and to segregate vehicular and pedestrian traffic. In the late 1940s, the American Public Health Association adopted these neighborhood models as the basis for standards to create and manage residential environments which protected the health, safety, and welfare of residents (Banerjee & Baer, 1984).

Frequently, neighborhood designs followed specific formats. In 1939, Clarence Perry attempted to incorporate existing social attitudes into his plans. Neighborhoods were geared towards families with children and it was believed that ethnic and income homogeneity was necessary because incompatible groups could lessen or destroy owner-occupancy appeal. Perry's neighborhood designs included four elements: an elementary school, small parks and playgrounds, small stores, and buildings and streets to allow public facilities to be within safe walking distance. Neighborhood size was restricted by the population the elementary school could absorb. Through traffic was directed to streets between neighborhoods and internal streets were kept small to discourage outside traffic. Shops were placed at traffic and neighborhood junctions and institutions were grouped around central points. Inside the neighborhood, open spaces were arranged to meet local needs (Banerjee & Baer, 1984).

Successful Neighborhoods

People continually tried to create better community models. In 1898, Ebenezer Howard promoted the Garden City, a city in which industry, agriculture, and residences would be incorporated into a self-sufficient community (Jacobs, 1961). In her classic work, *The Death and Life of Great American Cities* (1961), Jane Jacobs noted healthy communities must have diversity of uses, both economic and social. To ensure diversity she prescribed satisfying four conditions. First, areas must serve more than one function, preferably, more than two to ensure the presence of people who go outdoors at different times for different reasons but who have access to common facilities. Second, blocks should be short with frequent corners to encourage both foot and vehicular traffic throughout the community. Third, there should be buildings of various age and condition which vary in the economic yield they produce. Finally, the area should support a dense concentration of people. Jacobs believed these conditions would ensure a community of people who were dispersed throughout their area, aware of what was going on within it, and therefore, better prepared to respond to negative influences on the community.

Goldstein and Davis (1977) determined a neighborhood that works is one in which an urban area achieves an economic balance between the neighborhood's supply of particular goods and services and the market demand for them. A healthy neighborhood assembles people and enterprises compatible with the neighborhood's roles and is able to attract

market demand from surrounding communities. They conclude that neighborhood decline relates to a weakening role; the neighborhood loses its capacity to attract the people, businesses, and other investments which make the neighborhood work.

Declining Neighborhoods

Urban experts and neighborhood residents recognize that our cities and neighborhoods are in trouble. This is not a new phenomenon. For example, early in this century, New York was forced to close down parts of the city and move people to more densely populated sections because it could not afford to maintain its entire infrastructure (Konvitz, 1985).

There is a pattern which led to today's urban decline. Typically, middle and higher income individuals and families moved out of the city to surrounding communities which offered them more space, newer housing, and better schools for their children. Often businesses followed their employees and relocated to the suburbs. Usually, this pattern left lower income earners in the urban area. Frequently, the loss of tax dollars from departed residents and businesses left the city without enough funds to maintain its infrastructure and services, a condition which further encouraged additional residents and businesses to leave (Berry, 1985). Gottdiener (1987) notes these trends restructured urban areas from concentrated masses into sprawling metro regions of residential and

industrial centers lying outside the historic city. Urban expert Robert Cassidy noted: "Often a whole neighborhood can be adversely affected when just one part of the network begins to deteriorate" (Gay, 1985, p. 73).

Some theorists ascribe urban decline to the invention and increased use of the automobile and other technological advances. Access to freeway systems, light rail transit, and subway systems allowed individuals to live further away from their work. As transportation systems became crowded, and tax burdens increased on city businesses (to make up for lost residential taxes), the businesses moved out too. The federal government is also blamed for metropolitan deconcentration because programs and regulations such as those supporting the construction of interstate highways, tax relief for homeowners, G.I. bill subsidies for home buyers, and suburban defense employment supported the growth of suburban areas (Gottdiener, 1987).

To some degree, these patterns of decline are present in most large cities. In Minneapolis and St. Paul in the 1960s, 50% of the metropolitan population lived in the cities and 88% worked there. By the 1980s, only 31% lived in the cities and only 65% worked there. In the 1960s, city residents' average family income equaled the average family income for the entire area. By the 1980s, city residents' average income was less than half that of the average family income for the area. The flight of high income families has left these cities in a similar state as others, with increased percentages of single, minority, elderly, and unemployed people and the challenge of meeting their needs while attracting middle

and high income families back to their neighborhoods (Flanigan, Murphy, Peterson, & Raymond, 1989).

There is a certain population of middle and high income people who resist the call of the suburbs and live in the city. Berry (1985) reported certain young professionals, especially childless ones, live in city neighborhoods if housing is especially affordable and located to shorten their commutes to work, if it is close to places of historical or cultural interest, or if the area keeps them near attractions such as restaurant and theater districts. Berry notes these people are often artists, designers, or those interested in using sweat equity to get more from their housing investment. He also notes that these folks are mainly "stay-in-the-city" people, not people moving back to the city.

A discussion of urban decline would not be complete without a review of the process of gentrification. In this pattern, a few middle or high income people purchase property in an urban area and remodel their homes or businesses. This encourages more like-minded people to do the same. Frequently their activity is reported by the media attracting more people to the area. Individuals involved in this process are similar to the stay-in-the-city people in that they are usually childless and attracted to the city's cultural offerings, but they are also frequently unmarried, attracted to the idea
of multi-cultural exposures, and they have attained higher educational levels (Berry, 1985; Friedman, 1989).

On the surface, gentrification appears to be a positive influence on the city. Whole blocks or entire neighborhoods of old, worn houses can be remodeled and replaced with attractive, upscale homes and businesses which can then be assessed with higher property taxes. However, one effect of gentrification is to displace the people who were living in the original, lower-cost structures who do not have the resources or opportunity to participate in the development (U.S. Government Printing Office, 1994). Whole communities of low income people can be uprooted, leaving some homeless, some forced to move away from support services they require, and some without adequate transportation to get to their jobs. The net effect is an increased demand for social services and further stress on the city (Miller & Melvin, 1987; Logan & Molotch, 1987).

Some cities have tried to combat the negative effects of gentrification with legislation which requires developers to replace a percentage of the low income housing they tear down (Smith, 1996). These efforts are not typically successful because the percent mandated is often too small, there is not always a logical location to put replacement housing, and the displaced people are usually already scattered by the time projects are completed (Miller & Melvin, 1987; Logan & Molotch, 1987). In addition, some cities have created counter-legislation which restricts or prevents the building of low income housing within their boundaries, and communities often fight new low income housing because they feel they already have their fair share (Von Sternberg, 1995). Frequently, tenants' unions form in resistance to development plans: tenants' needs are often in conflict with those of the developers who seek higher rents to help finance their projects

(Lonetree, 1996).

Citizen Participation and the Federal Government

In the United States, formal neighborhood associations exist today, in great part, because of a history of federal support via legislation and funding. Previously, settlement house reformers in the 1900s concerned themselves with community reform and worked "to awaken slum dwellers to the awareness of social needs and responsibilities" (Miller & Melvin, 1987, p. 144). These reformers worked to strengthen their neighborhoods and cities by focusing on reconstruction, healthcare, youth activities, and creating a sense of community. However, it wasn't until the federal Housing Act of 1954 that legislation was passed which required citizen involvement, beyond public hearings, in the prioritization and review of capital improvement proposals.

In 1961, the President's Committee on Juvenile Delinquency promoted neighborhood participation as a means to foster maximum community participation and "administrative guidelines stipulated that residents of target areas should be involved at all levels in planning, and that neighborhood organizations should be encouraged as a means of giving the poor an influential voice in all matters pertaining to their interests" (Miller & Melvin, 1987, p. 207). But self-interested parties resisted increased neighborhood participation because of the perceived loss of power to themselves or the belief that they were experts

and the "amateur" neighborhood groups would slow progress and add unnecessary work. Resisting groups included professional planners, boards and agencies, leaders of old neighborhood associations, politicians, party organizers, and city officials (Miller & Melvin).

The 1964 Economic Opportunity Act was the first federal legislation to explicitly require participation by the poor. In the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965, Congress authorized HUD to require locally appointed and financed regional councils or planning boards to review all applications for federal funds from government units within their metropolitan areas (Miller & Melvin, 1987).

The 1966 Demonstration and Metropolitan Development Act was the first federal program with a neighborhood focus. If a city wanted Model Cities funds it had to establish a system in which neighborhood groups could participate in policy and implementation. In 1968, Urban Renewal legislation was enacted which further emphasized grass-roots participation (Hult, 1984; Miller & Melvin, 1987).

The 1974 Housing and Community Development Act combined funds from diverse urban grant programs into one large block grant to be distributed to city governments in funding packages. Agencies applying for funds had to meet criteria laid down in the federal legislation. Originally, citizen participation guidelines were loose, but they were strengthened by an amendment in 1977 (Hult, 1984).

During President Reagan's administration, federal government commitment to citizen participation was reduced as programs and budgets were cut and there were moves to privatize services such as transit and garbage removal. At this point, some neighborhood groups lost much of their funding and formal power (Hult, 1984; Miller & Melvin, 1987).

Formalizing Citizen Participation in Minneapolis

Although there was already a long history of citizen involvement in Minneapolis, the formalization of citizen organizations can be linked to the creation of the Minneapolis Housing and Redevelopment Authority (MHRA). In 1947, state legislation authorized cities to establish housing and redevelopment authorities to eliminate urban blight and provide low-cost housing (MCDA, 1994).

In Minneapolis, in the early 1950s, there was strong reaction to the 1956 state freeway plan and to downtown businesses losing customers to suburban shopping malls. The Minneapolis Planning Department "...encouraged development of strong neighborhood groups to advocate for neighborhood improvement in areas showing signs of slipping" (Heath, 1981) and a variety of neighborhood groups organized to work on zoning, development, traffic control, and housing issues. Usually, the school was the neighborhood center for services and neighborhood organization efforts were typically focused on actions oriented to their local school or park (Heath).

In the late 1950s, the Planning Commission divided Minneapolis into 87 residential neighborhoods organized in ten communities. Neighborhoods were named after elementary schools to promote identity and organization. The city pursued federal funding for various projects and moved capital program decisions to citizen advisory groups. Neighborhood groups began to have more formal power as federal programs mandated increasing public involvement (Heath, 1981).

Poverty and racism were political issues in the late 1960s and early 1970s. Federal money was directed to the war on poverty and efforts were made to redistribute money and power to the impoverished and to encourage widespread citizen participation. Some federal target area neighborhoods received enough funding to hire their own staff and to have control over services in their area. Frequently, the fight for money and power created adversarial relationships between neighborhoods and local elected officials. As a result, there was increased politicalization of neighborhood organizations as they began to pick and promote their own political candidates (Heath, 1981).

When federal funding was reduced and the 1974 Housing and Community Development Act established Community Development Block Grants (CDBG), Minneapolis neighborhoods saw a threat and organized to install a formal citizen participation structure. They were able to get support from elected officials, and, by 1976, the city had established planning district citizen advisory committees (PDCAC) to funnel input into the distribution of block grants and the formulation and implementation of city plans

(Hult, 1984; Whitehurst & Smith, 1988).

In the 1980s, as a result of federal and state cutbacks, neighborhood organizations lost most of their funding and formal power. The federal Department of Housing and Urban Development loosened its requirement for citizen participation and eliminated related programs (Hult, 1984).

In 1981, under special authority from the Minnesota State Legislature, the Minneapolis City Council combined the MHRA and the Minneapolis Industrial Development Corporation into the Minneapolis Community Development Agency (MCDA, 1994). In 1982, despite public and mayoral opposition, the city council slashed funding used to staff citizen groups from $300,000 to $62,000 and they stripped the PDCACs of their formal advisory status. Instead, the council created the MCDA's Center for Citizen Participation; groups were directed to register with the new department if they wanted to be consulted by the city when proposed projects affected their area (Hult, 1984).

In the 1990s, "the MCDA is the development arm of the City of Minneapolis....and the focus of all MCDA programs and projects is to stabilize and improve neighborhoods" (MCDA, 1994, p. 3). The MCDA continues to administer CDBG funds to neighborhood organizations which, through participation agreements, contract to receive recognition and funding in return for keeping citizens in their areas informed about MCDA projects and programs (MCDA, 1995).

In 1996, Minneapolis policy and some elected officials continue to promote citizen participation. Much of the Mayor's four-year budget and policy plan discussed the need to increase citizen awareness and activity in order to reduce crime, stabilize neighborhoods, and improve economic conditions (City of Minneapolis, 1994). Additionally, the Neighborhood Revitalization Program (NRP), which produces long-range citizen-developed action plans to guide the allocation of millions of dollars and public resources for neighborhoods, depends on Minneapolis neighborhood organizations for program ideas and plan implementations. Typically, existing neighborhood organizations oversee an NRP steering committee along with their other committees (Minneapolis Neighborhood Revitalization Program, 1992).

In Minneapolis, increased neighborhood organization activity and NRP efforts have encouraged the growth of other groups interested in citizen participation programs and their relationship with the city. One such group, The Minneapolis Center for Neighborhoods, produces an annual report which describes neighborhood efforts, judges public agencies' success in working with the neighborhood organizations, and makes recommendations (The Minneapolis Center for Neighborhoods, 1996). In addition to publishing a newsletter, they sponsor focus groups and roundtable discussions throughout the year in which residents from Minneapolis neighborhoods can share ideas and discuss programs.

Neighborhood Organizations

The United States Government Printing Office (1976) defined community as "a social group of any size whose members reside in a specific locality, share government, and have a common cultural and historical heritage." Although areas of ethnic similarity still exist today, many urban citizens do not seem to share a common culture; instead, there are communities with individuals of diverse ethnic, racial, and socioeconomic backgrounds and there are frequent media reports about cities, neighborhoods, and families in crisis.

Gottdiener (1987) notes Americans have a long history of government involvement and a propensity for organizing themselves into a variety of formal associations; neighborhood organizations would appear a natural result of these tendencies. Although our country's increasing diversity sometimes leads to friction, there are also reports of the same issues leading to an increase in neighborhood organization memberships.

Cunningham & Kotler (1983) view citizen participation as one way to reduce social tension and heighten civic values. A recent study reported in the Star Tribune (1995) found individuals who were involved in their community more likely to be tolerant of others, optimistic about the state of the nation, and less likely to harbor hostility towards people they perceived as unlike themselves. Another study (Star Tribune, 1994) of individuals and community involvement, found people actively involved in social groups

less likely to be on drugs, more likely to be in good health, and more likely to have a higher sense of their own social connectedness. Flanagan (1993) reported that neighborhood organizations foster the development of informal ties between neighborhood residents and that those ties help to create a sense of identity and connection in the neighborhood.

Some neighborhood organizations form in response to a single issue (Davidson, 1979). For example, citizens might group to fight a proposed development project or to discuss an issue which affects their children. Some groups break up after their original issue is resolved, others build on the skills they developed and decide to take a larger role. These groups often become mediators between their neighborhood and the city, amplifying their private troubles and turning them into public issues. Many organizations end up addressing problems in a variety of areas including education, health, housing, public safety, recreation, business, and the environment (Wattenberg, 1979).

Membership in Neighborhood Organizations

There is general agreement that "an active, involved neighborhood increases the bargaining power of the least advantaged" (Wattenberg, 1979, p.2) but studies frequently report an absence of representation of minority and low-income people and over-representation of whites, women, homeowners, and the middle-class (Martin & Goodard,

1989). Several studies indicate the most likely people to be involved in neighborhood organizations are white, homeowning, women, aged 35 or older, of middle to higher socioeconomic status, with a college rather than a high school degree (Davidson, 1979; Friedman, 1989; Star Tribune, 1995).

Social scientists have written explanations for the different degrees of participation between the least and more advantaged. Fessler (1976) explained that children of the disadvantaged often grow up without role models who participate in special interest groups. Frequently, the children attend schools with budgets which are too tight to allow opportunities to expose the children to organized activities which would teach them skills and interests useful in adult cooperative activities. As a result, in adulthood they become the "uninterested (Fessler, 1976)."

Davidson (1979) and Logan & Molotch (1987) agree that people of higher socioeconomic status are more likely to be involved in citizen participation. Logan & Molotch note this is not because of personality characteristics related to race, class, or ethnic groups, but because of the set of interrelated advantages of being more affluent. These include financial and political resources, residential stability, and a history of association with organizations. Wealthier individuals also tend to have the luxury of more time and energy to devote to their interests. Davidson noted persons of higher socioeconomic status have an easier time participating because their education and organizational talents make it easier to create and sustain political activity.

In seeking to understand what initially brought people into their neighborhood organizations, Fessler (1976) noted the motivation frequently stemmed from a pragmatic desire to maintain the quality of residential environments and property investments. A study reported by Friedman (1989) confirmed these findings and noted individuals most often cited as their initial reason for joining community groups a wish to improve their residential neighborhood rather than a sense of duty or a need to influence others. Several studies indicate homeowners are likely to be involved because they are more rooted to their neighborhoods (Fessler, 1976; Logan & Molotch, 1987; Friedman, 1989). Logan & Molotch reported that women, because they continue to carry larger shares of household and child-rearing burdens, have stronger reasons to be concerned about issues which effect their environment and greater motivation to do something about them.

The literature does not reveal much about why those actively involved in neighborhood organizations stop participating. Davidson (1979) suggested most individuals get involved temporarily in political activity when an issue becomes important to them. When the issue is resolved, the individual usually returns to personal pursuits. Wattenberg reported "enormous amounts of time and a high tolerance for frustration are two essential characteristics for citizen participants and the burn-out rate is high....[while] the pool of available citizens for these intensely absorbing tasks is small" (1979, p. 3).

Beyond general neighborhood organization demographics, the literature reveals little about the individuals within the groups, the staff, or the volunteer people running them.

In 1990, the Center for Urban and Regional Affairs published survey results on professional neighborhood organizers in the Twin Cities (Smith & Whitehurst). Nearly 40% of respondents indicated membership in a neighborhood organization had helped prepare them for their work as paid organizers but there was little else to help with the focus of this work.

In the late 1960s and early 1970s, Saul Alinsky wrote on the subject of activism and professional community organizers. Instead of trying to get an entire community to actively participate in politics, he believed the appropriate strategy for a professional organizer was to get a few people interested enough in an issue to participate in the democratic process. Alinsky (1969) believed cities lacked organization on local levels and that this led to isolation and barriers between organizations and individual citizens. Without a means to participate, citizens responded with apathy. Alinsky was concerned about democracy's survival if the ordinary citizen's role was limited to periodic voting with no other means of influencing their political, social, and economic environment. Alinsky observed that the nation's poor were also closely correlated with the nation's minorities. He realized organizing all of the minorities would not make a big enough coalition of influence so his solution was for professional organizers to mobilize middle class volunteers and to instill in them the value of a free and open society (Alinsky, 1969).

In *Rules For Radicals*, he outlined the role of the professional organizer in helping

communities understand their proper duty and he described qualities which made good organizers. One interesting, though disturbing, idea was that an organizer would not always be able to make decisions which agreed with his or her conscience but that organizers should always choose mass salvation over their own personal beliefs and conscience. Traits for organizers included curiosity, irreverence, imagination, a sense of humor, and an organized personality. The ability to communicate and to use communication tools was also important (Alinsky, 1971).

Using Alinsky's methods, neighborhood organizations often employ a confrontative style as they try to influence local politicians and political entities. Many organizations feel justified in using this approach because they see themselves in an adversarial position to city officials (Citizens League, 1983; Hult 1984; Whitehurst & Smith, 1988), believe local interests lose out to big developers (Hult, 1984), or they have experienced clashes with elected officials and public employees who resist neighborhood interference from a fear of losing control (Citizens League, 1983).

Sometimes, neighborhood organizations seek to change the balance of power by letter writing, picketing, or appearing in front of city councils; periodically, they campaign to get one of their own people elected to political positions (Hult, 1984). Davidson (1979) observed that community groups were more likely to influence political decision makers if they had a consistent history of communicating with them. He and other social experts (Belluck, 1996) agree that it is frequently more successful to form partnerships with

elected politicians than to continue to resist them. Many neighborhood leaders, however, have a tradition of resistance and do not "have the skills or temperament to develop the kinds of sustained, collaborative relationships needed....to reshape their perspective and style [and] to engage in more cooperative relationships" (Citizens League, 1983). As a warning against too much partnership, Zimmerman (1986) cautioned against cooptation, a process in which elected officials try to secure commitment and support for their programs from citizen committees. Zimmerman notes cooptation can be especially prevalent when citizen representatives are chosen by city officials.

Good Leadership in Neighborhood Organizations

Throughout the literature, there is agreement that neighborhood groups only involve a small portion of the people in their locality (Fessler, 1976; Davidson, 1979; Citizens League, 1983). Alinsky (1971) noted the goal was to get a group of people organized around an interest rather than trying to organize all of the people in a specific geographic community. It was also observed that neighborhood leaders are not necessarily those that neighborhood residents would or could readily acknowledge as community leaders. However, most neighborhood leaders' concerns and issues were representative of neighborhood sentiment (Citizens League, 1983; Jones, 1987).

To ensure community support, the literature lists several cautions for neighborhood

leadership: set up structures which keep elected board members accountable for their actions (Zimmerman, 1986), hold regular, open meetings with membership open to all residents (Citizens League, 1983), and perform self-checks to ensure the pursuit of objectives which are truly representative of the neighborhood's concerns and not just projects of private interest (Jones, 1987).

Fessler (1976) warned neighborhood leaders not to assume members were homogeneous and all equally attached to the group's activities and objectives. To encourage ongoing participation and broad based support, leaders were counseled to ensure members' psychological needs were met. Fessler described the role of a neighborhood leader as that of change agent and he outlined appropriate attitudes, skills, and behaviors which would foster successful group environments. Zimmerman (1986) agreed the best way to gain support for group decisions and to overcome resistance to change was to involve members in project plans and in making decisions.

Fessler (1976) discussed leadership theory in relation to neighborhood organizations and concluded that most previous concepts of leadership were outmoded. He suggested that neighborhood leadership be situational and functional. Individuals would have certain skills for different situations and leadership would consist of the performance of tasks required at different times. He stressed the importance of finding group-centered leaders who could create and function in such a climate.

Other literature advised neighborhood leadership on collaborating with external

institutions to get funding, additional resources, or operational procedures (Jones, 1987); on the importance of setting up rules, norms, and sanctions which ensured good group communications (Heller, Price, Ranharz, Riger, & Wandersman, 1984); and on the importance of evaluating issues to pick those which neighborhood organizations could actually impact (Cunningham & Kotler, 1983).

Cunningham & Kotler (1983) also discussed the need to build in training so new members have skills to help them feel competent and successful. Though few of the organizations they studied had systematic training programs, they noted "training and leadership development is the essential skill of helping them [individual members] become useful to the organization, which is usually what holds members in...." (p. 167). Hult (1984) also noted the importance of having neighborhood group members trained so that they are prepared with a level of organizational skill and knowledge of their group's infrastructure and roles when they encounter crisis or hostility from outsiders.

Literature Summary and Hypotheses

The literature review identified that there is a large volume of information on the evolution of neighborhoods, past and present neighborhood decline, and theories on what makes a neighborhood healthy. Although this paper does not intend to test theories on urban America, background information on these topics was useful in providing an understanding of the current cycle of neighborhood decline and in providing support for the premise that it is worthwhile for citizens to be actively involved in their community group's efforts to stabilize or improve their neighborhood.

The literature noted that community involvement was positive for neighborhoods and for the residents because it created a feeling of connectedness, and the people involved were less likely to use drugs or to harbor hostilities towards others, and more likely to be in better health and to be more tolerant of others.

The literature confirmed that Minneapolis shares a problem facing other large cities, that of declining income levels and rising numbers of minorities and people in poverty among their residents. This is important to note because the literature revealed that most neighborhood groups, including those under contract with the Minneapolis Community Development Agency (MCDA), are expected to be representative of their community even though the literature also identified underlying difficulties in getting the less-advantaged populations involved in their community groups. Most studies identified an

absence of representation of minority and low-income residents

and an over-representation of whites, women, homeowners, middle-class income earners, and individuals with college degrees versus high school diplomas. There was nothing cited in the literature that would suggest Minneapolis neighborhood groups would be able to avoid the problems found in groups in other cities, therefore, **the first hypothesis for this study is that a survey of Minneapolis neighborhood organization leaders would find white, middle or upper income, college graduate, homeowning, women, in the majority and that this group would not be representative of the population of Minneapolis residents.**

There has been a significant amount written on various activities of neighborhood groups and on their work methods and philosophies but, despite several decades of citizen involvement in the United States, very little information could be found about individual participants. Some studies indicated individuals were less likely to get involved in their neighborhood group out of a sense of duty and more likely to become involved if they were concerned about a certain issue facing their community or if they have lived in their neighborhood for some time, own a home, and wish to protect or improve their neighborhood. This information leads to **the second hypothesis, that neighborhood leaders would report their motivation for becoming, and staying involved in their groups, stemmed from concern for their property values and the safety of their neighborhood rather than from a sense of duty to their community.** There were no studies identified which discussed neighborhood group participants as individuals or

which provided information on how they felt about their group, what they did in association with their group, or how they spent their time. Therefore, one of the objectives of this exploratory study will be to gather information from neighborhood leaders about these areas.

The literature noted active citizen participation in Minneapolis, especially in conjunction with the Neighborhood Revitalization Program (NRP), but even the MCDA, which provides financial support for neighborhood groups through their citizen participation contracts, lacks information on the specific individuals involved in Minneapolis neighborhood groups. The literature did note complaints from neighborhood group participants that too much time is needed to attend meetings and work on tasks, and that members frequently quit their groups because they feel burnt out. This leads to **the third hypothesis, that neighborhood group leaders would indicate concern over the time required in connection with their group and that they will indicate burnout as a primary reason they would stop participating in their group.**

Finally, the literature review identified that neighborhood group members are frequently expected to manage complex responsibilities for their organizations and that training would be useful to build skills in problem-solving and conflict management, or to provide assistance in completing tasks which require financial or legal expertise.
However, most studies found that few groups had training programs in place. Although the MCDA and the NRP offer training courses and video taped training, **the fourth**

hypothesis is that few neighborhood groups will have an active training program in place for their leaders and members and that few individuals will have participated in available training programs. It is further predicted that respondents in this study will make observations that this is a problem for their organizations.

Information on the individuals who participate in neighborhood organizations was clearly missing from the body of literature on citizen participation groups and related subject areas. As inner cities, including Minneapolis, face severe concerns, and as communities are turning to local citizen groups, such as the Minneapolis neighborhood organizations, for more assistance in solving problems and determining how limited resources will be allocated, it seems clear that an exploratory study providing more detailed information on the people running the neighborhood groups would be useful and of interest.

RESEARCH DESIGN

In 1990, the Center for Urban and Regional Affairs (Smith & Whitehurst) in Minneapolis, Minnesota surveyed directors and program staff of neighborhood organizations to gather demographic information on professional organizers, to learn how to increase the training opportunities and job satisfaction of existing organizers, and to learn how to attract new people and prepare them for this occupation. The published report of their study influenced this research project by providing ideas and examples for collecting the same type of information from volunteer neighborhood leaders.

For this exploratory study, a neighborhood leader was defined as an officer, board member, or committee chair in one of the neighborhood organizations listed in the Minneapolis Community Development Agency's (MCDA) January, 1996 Directory of Minneapolis Neighborhood Groups. The directory listed names, addresses, chairpersons, phone numbers, and meeting dates for 72 neighborhood groups.

With permission from the MCDA, the directory was used to make telephone contact with the chairperson or president in each group listed. Following a phone guide (see Phone Guide for Conversations with Neighborhood Group Chairpersons in Appendix A) for these telephone conversations, the study was explained, assistance was requested in putting the survey on their board's next meeting agenda and in handing the survey out to

each of their leaders, and arrangements were made to get the number of surveys needed to them before their next board meeting. Each of the 72 individuals contacted agreed to provide the requested assistance.

Although some were mailed, most survey packages were dropped off at the residence of the contacted individual or at their neighborhood group's office. A personalized cover letter (See Letter to Chairpersons in Appendix B) was attached to remind them of their commitment and to provide distribution instructions. Originally a follow-up call to the chairperson was going to be part of the process, but the Augsburg College Institutional Review Board was concerned that the call would negatively or unevenly influence survey return so no follow-up calls were made.

Attached to each survey was a consent letter for survey participants (see Letter of Instruction for Neighborhood Group Member in Appendix C). The letter explained in detail the purpose of the study, how information would be used, how confidentiality would be maintained, and who they could call for further information. To increase the number of returned surveys, preaddressed, stamped envelopes were provided to send the survey back to the researcher.

To collect demographics, information on the role these individuals see themselves playing, the experience they bring to their positions, and areas potentially requiring further training, a three-paged, double-sided survey was created (see Survey of

Leadership - Minneapolis Neighborhood Groups in Appendix D). The survey used 37 questions, both multiple-choice and open-ended, to gather information about neighborhood leaders. As several survey questions requested personal information, and the population of surveyed Minneapolis neighborhood leaders was small, respondents were not asked to provide their names, or the name of the neighborhood group or community they represented. In total, 1,000 surveys were provided to group chairpersons.

The data-gathering process, as well as the letters and survey used, were reviewed and approved by the Institutional Review Board at Augsburg College. The approval number was 95-06-3. The software used to organize and tabulate survey responses was the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) for Microsoft Windows, release 6.1.

To maintain the anonymity of respondents, returned surveys were separated from their return envelopes and stored under lock and key in the researcher's home. Surveys will be shredded and discarded by the researcher upon the approved completion of this thesis.

For assistance in determining that neighborhood leaders are, or are not, demographically representative of their community, additional data on Minneapolis residents was required. Statistics on Minneapolis residents, from the 1990 United States census, were used for comparison when the survey was analyzed. Care was taken when creating the survey to make response choices to demographic questions match the 1990 census categories so

that comparisons were possible.

FINDINGS

Response Rate

Of the 1,000 surveys distributed to neighborhood groups, 292 were returned and tabulated. Each of the 72 groups was asked the number of surveys they would need in order to give one survey to each of their board members and chairpersons. Although their requests totaled 1000, or an average of 14 per group, a review of the Minneapolis Community Development Agency's (MCDA) neighborhood participation agreements identified that a typical board consists of from 7 to 9 individuals and survey results indicate that board members often chair committees. This indicates that the 1000 requested might have been too large of a number and that a more appropriate total would have been about 600. If 600 is a more accurate number, then the survey return rate would be 48.6%.

Based on 1000 surveys, the return rate was 29.2%. Although this return rate was too small to guarantee a reliable, quantitative report, it was large enough for the purpose of this initial, exploratory study. A full report of survey responses can be found in Appendix E.

Hypothesis 1: The majority of Minneapolis neighborhood group leaders are white, middle or upper-income, college graduate, homeowning, women, and this group is not representative of the population of Minneapolis residents.

This initial hypothesis proved only partially correct as there was an equal number of men and women among respondents. Of the 292 individuals responding to the survey, exactly 50%, or 146, were male and 50%, or 146, were female. This nearly mirrors census data for Minneapolis which reported the population as 49% male and 51% female (Bureau of the Census, 1991).

The hypothesis was correct regarding race, income, education, and home ownership. Although census data (Table 1) reported 78% of the population of Minneapolis was white, 93.5% of survey respondents were white (Table 2). Census data reported Minneapolis' black population at 13% but only .7% were represented among survey respondents. These results indicate support still exists for the results and conclusions presented by Fessler (1976) and Martin & Goodard (1989).

TABLE 1
Census data for Minneapolis (Bureau of the Census, 1991) reported the following race distributions:

3.0%	aleutian, american indian, eskimo
4.0	asian, pacific islander
13.0	black
78.0	white
2.0	other

TABLE 2

Survey responses fell into the following race distributions:

.3%	aleutian
.7	american indian
.3	asian
.7	black
.0	eskimo
1.0	hispanic
.0	pacific islander
93.5	white
1.0	other
2.4	no response

Neighborhood leaders were asked to report their personal (Table 3) and their household income (Table 4). The median household income for survey respondents was between $50,000 and $59,999, twice the median household income of $25,324 reported for Minneapolis residents in *The County and City Data Book* (Bureau of the Census, 1994).

TABLE 3

Personal income

24.3%	under $20,000
15.8	$20,000 - $29,999
19.9	$30,000 - $39,999
10.6	$40,000 - $49,999
9.6	$50,000 - $59,999
8.2	$60,000 - $99,999
4.1	$100,000 or more
7.5	no response

TABLE 4

Household income

8.2%	under $20,000
9.9	$20,000 - $29,999
16.4	$30,000 - $39,999
13.0	$40,000 - $49,999
12.3	$50,000 - $59,999
24.7	$60,000 - $99,999
8.9	$100,000 or more
6.5	no response

When gender was correlated to personal income (Table 5), it was interesting to note that income for male respondents was more evenly distributed than income for female respondents, and females reported lower incomes. When gender was correlated to household income (Table 6), the percentages for female respondents were more evenly distributed.

TABLE 5

Gender correlated to personal income

	male	female
<$20,000	13%	36%
20-29,999	13%	18%
30-39,999	23%	17%
40-49,999	15%	6%
50-59,999	12%	8%
60-99,999	10%	6%
100->	7%	1%
no response	7%	8%

TABLE 6

Gender correlated to household income

	male	female
<$20,000	10%	7%
20-29,999	6%	14%
30-39,999	12%	20%
40-49,999	14%	12%
50-59,999	15%	9%
60-99,999	29%	21%
100->	8%	10%
no response	6%	7%

In the area of education, nearly 70% of survey respondents had achieved a college degree or done graduate work (Table 7), whereas, according to the *Statistical Abstract of the United States* (Bureau of the Census, 1994), only 22% of Minneapolis residents (Table 8) attained that level.

TABLE 7

Educational attainment of survey respondents

.7%	some high school
5.1	high school
1.0	some technical school
3.4	technical school/s
16.8	some college
3.1	associate degree/s
26.7	bachelor degree/s
14.7	some graduate level work
24.0	graduate degree/s
3.4	PhD./s
1.0	no response

TABLE 8
Educational attainment of Minnesotans aged 25 or older

17.6%	did not graduate high school
33.0	high school graduate
19.0	some college
8.6	associate degree
15.6	bachelor degree
6.2	graduate degree

Finally, Hypothesis 1 was confirmed with regard to home ownership. In 1993, 76.9% of Minneapolis' housing structures were owner occupied (City Planning Department, 1994). In this survey, a majority of 87% were homeowners, 8.6% rented, 2.7% had other living arrangements, and 1.7% choose not to respond.

Hypothesis 2: Neighborhood group leaders became and stay involved in their groups because of a concern for their property values and the safety of their neighborhood rather than from a sense of duty to their community.

Neighborhood group leaders definitely had a vested interest in their neighborhood. The majority of respondents had lived five or more years in Minneapolis (Table 9), lived within the boundaries of their neighborhood group (Table 10), a third also work in their neighborhood (Table 11), and a large majority own property in the neighborhood (Table 12), much of which is residential (Table 13). Most group leaders had been in their group longer than one year (Table 14). About 20% of the respondents were new members, having been in their group less than one year.

TABLE 9

Years lived in Minneapolis

1.4%	0-1 year
11.3	>1-5 years
10.3	>5-10 years
61.0	>10 years
16.1	no response

TABLE 10

Reside within neighborhood group's boundaries

93.2%	yes
6.5	no
.3	no response

TABLE 11

Work within same neighborhood

33.9%	yes
63.0	no
3.1	no response

TABLE 12

Own property in the neighborhood

87.0%	yes
12.3	no
.7	no response

TABLE 13

Property type

83.6%	residential
1.0	commercial
1.7	both
13.7	no response

TABLE 14

Years active in neighborhood group

19.9%	0-1 year
51.0	>1-5 years
15.4	>5-10 years
13.4	>10 years
.3	no response

Hypothesis 2 proved partially correct in explaining group leaders' motivations for joining and staying in their groups, but survey respondents noted many other reasons besides wanting to protect their property values and concerns about safety, including a sense of duty to their community. Although 26.4% said they initially went to a neighborhood meeting because of concern about their neighborhood and their desire to protect it, many other reasons for going were cited (Table 15). These included an interest in a specific issue, a desire to contribute to society or to be a good citizen, and curiosity. When asked what made them decide to actively participate in the group (Table 16), 18.2% said they wanted to help preserve the neighborhood, but over a third said they were motivated from a desire to contribute and several other reasons were noted.

TABLE 15

Initial reason for going to neighborhood meetings

.3%	for their children
2.1	multiple reasons
2.7	to participate in committee work
5.5	wanted to be a good citizen
13.7	invited by someone else
14.0	a single issue
15.1	had a desire to contribute
16.4	curious to see what was going on
26.4	wanted to protect their neighborhood
3.8	no response

TABLE 16

Reason for deciding to actively participate in the group

2.1%	multiple reasons
3.1	other
5.8	saw a need to add diversity
6.8	the people participating
11.6	projects the group worked on
12.7	was asked
18.2	to help preserve the neighborhood
33.9	wanted to contribute
5.8	no response

Although neighborhood decline and safety continue to be concerns among neighborhood leaders (Table 17), the main reasons for staying in the group (Table 18) included the other members and an interest in the projects. Many respondents' written comments were positive statements about the people they worked with in their neighborhood group, the new relationships they had with their neighbors, and the success they felt their group had achieved. Repeatedly, respondents wrote that they would continue to be active in their group until death or a move from the area.

Although the literature review (Fessler, 1976; Friedman, 1989) suggested individuals were more likely to participate from concern over their property values than over a sense of duty, this was not supported by these survey results. There appeared to be more evidence that neighborhood group leaders were continuing to participate because they thought their group was accomplishing something worthwhile (Table 19), because they felt positive about the projects they worked on and the people they worked with (Table 20), and because it allowed them to fulfill a perceived obligation to society (Table 21), as

well as stabilize and improve their community (Table 22).

TABLE 17

Concerns about their community

.7%	schools
1.0	discrimination
1.7	lack of diversity
1.7	environmental
1.7	youth
3.1	inadequate community control
6.2	economic conditions
7.2	declining housing
9.2	apathy, no commitment
15.8	crime, safety
20.2	multiple concern
22.9	neighborhood decline
8.6	no response

TABLE 18

Why they would stay in the group

1.6%	concern over conflicting goals in the group
1.7	have the group attend training
2.4	less time is required
2.4	unsure
2.7	neighborhood continues to improve
6.8	multiple reasons
6.8	compensation or appreciation
8.9	I'm just staying
14.0	more volunteers are attracted to help
38.0	the people and the continuing success of the projects
14.7	no response

TABLE 19

Is their group accomplishing something worthwhile

91.4%	yes
2.1	no
4.1	unsure
2.4	no response

TABLE 20
Satisfaction with neighborhood group

1.0%	the improving neighborhood
1.4	multiple responses
4.5	diversity
28.1	successful projects
55.5	the people and sense of community
9.5	no response

TABLE 21
Important to them in their neighborhood group role fulfilling an obligation to community or society

80.5%	yes
19.5	no

TABLE 22
Stabilizing or improving the area in which they live or work

89.7%	yes
10.3	no

Hypothesis 3: Neighborhood group leaders will indicate concern over the time required in connection with their group and they will indicate burnout as a primary reason they would stop participating in their group.

Hypothesis 3 was supported by survey results. 43.2% of the respondents reported they were uncertain how much longer they would stay in their neighborhood group but 28.8% expected it to be less than 5 years (Table 23). When asked why they would leave their group (Table 24), 8.6% indicated burnout and 13% said because too much time was needed to participate. When asked about their dissatisfaction with their group (Table 25), 18.5% said too much process or time was needed and 26.7% said too few people were involved. Further support exists in Table 18 where 14% said they would be encouraged to stay in their group if more volunteers could be attracted to help.

When asked what their group should focus on next (Table 26), 28.1% said attract more people. When asked what support their group would need to move forward (Table 27), 6.8% said more staff (to help with the work) and 8.2% said more money (to get more staff to help with the work). 23.3% thought their group should focus on getting more people involved. As reported in Table 28, 36.3% wished to reduce their responsibility level and, although 18.8% said they would like to take on more responsibilities, respondents frequently noted that they were unable to because of the amount of time their current responsibilities already take.

TABLE 23

How many more years they anticipate staying in their group

43.2%	uncertain
11.3	<3 years
17.5	3-5 years
5.8	6-9 years
4.8	10-15 years
16.4	15 or more years
1.0	no response

TABLE 24

Why they would leave the group

1.0%	unsure
4.1	leave to open spaces for others
4.5	group's goals or focus changed
5.5	group was not accomplishing anything
6.8	to do other things
6.8	conflict in the group
7.5	multiple reasons
8.6	burnout
9.6	death
13.0	too much time needed
27.7	move out of the neighborhood
4.8	no response

TABLE 25

Dissatisfaction with neighborhood group

2.4%	lack of diversity
3.1	multiple responses
4.1	the relationship with the city
5.1	irrelevant issues
6.8	nothing
8.6	conflicts
14.0	personal agendas
18.5	too much process or time spent
26.7	too few people involved
10.7	no response

TABLE 26

What their group should do next

.3%	have more fun
.7	have less conflict
1.4	unsure
1.4	get some training
1.7	multiple responses
2.4	communicate more to the community
2.4	use less process
10.6	focus on issues
11.3	develop a strategic plan
12.7	stay as is
28.1	attract more people
27.0	no response

TABLE 27

What support the group would need to move forward

1.0%	a role model
2.4	to get more organized
4.1	nothing, able as is
4.8	unsure
5.8	more training
6.8	more staff
8.2	more money
9.2	more community awareness and support
23.3	more people
34.4	no response

TABLE 28
Wish to take on more or less responsibility

18.8%	more
36.3	less
34.9	stay at same level
10.0	no response

These issues were also echoed in respondents' written comments. They frequently noted their concern that more people had to be attracted to their groups, mainly because there were too few people to get their work accomplished and because they thought they would eventually burn out if they continued to participate at their current level. Many were disgusted with the apathy they saw in their community and many noted frustration with members in their neighborhood group who attended meetings but did not volunteer to help with tasks or projects.

Respondents complained about the length of time it took to get anything done. They noted too much process, which they described as too much talk and too few actions decided or taken, also too many meetings. Several wrote that their group really needed to develop a strategic plan, get more organized, and focus on a few manageable goals instead of trying to take on too many projects at one time. Many complained about the length of time their Neighborhood Revitalization Project plans were taking.

It is easy to see why the respondents felt so strongly about these issues. Apparently they are already busy people. 75.7% were employed in some capacity (Table 29), 75.7% indicated they participate in other volunteer or community groups (Table 30), a majority

of the respondents have been active in more than one volunteer group in the last five years (Table 31), and the majority held leadership positions in those groups (Table 32).

TABLE 29
Employment

21.6%	self employed
1.4	unemployed
7.9	employed part-time
45.5	employed full-time
4.5	homemaker
10.3	retired
.7	employed student
1.0	unemployed student
7.2	no response

TABLE 30
Participation in other volunteer or community groups

75.7%	yes
21.2	no
3.1	no response

TABLE 31
Number of volunteer groups in past five years

3.0%	none
10.3	one
12.7	two
17.1	three
13.7	four
36.0	five or more
7.2	no response

TABLE 32
Volunteer groups in which they hold leadership positions

17.1%	none
30.8	one
28.8	two
9.6	three
3.1	four
3.4	five or more
7.2	no response

Hypothesis 4: Few neighborhood groups have an active training program in place for their leaders and members and few individuals have participated in available training programs. It is further predicted that respondents in this study will make observations that this is a problem for their organizations.

The first statement in Hypothesis 4 proved correct. Only 9.6% of the respondents reported receiving training from their neighborhood group (Table 33); 17.8% noted that their group offered access to city and non-profit courses (Table 34), but only 31.5% of the respondents had actually participated in city offered training and nearly all of those received training related to a specific program such as the Neighborhood Revitalization Program. Nearly one third of the respondents reported finding training on their own (Table 35), 17.5% through reading or school coursework, the rest through networking or programs in their workplace.

TABLE 33

Training the neighborhood group provided

1.4%	leadership
8.2	board member
17.8	access to city and non-profit courses
53.4	none
19.2	no response

TABLE 34

Training the city provided

.3%	conflict management
31.2	specific program
50.7	none
17.8	no response

TABLE 35
Training respondents found on their own

1.0%	computer
4.8	education through their workplace
8.6	networking
17.5	reading or school classes
37.7	none
30.4	no response

The second statement in Hypothesis 4, the prediction that respondents would find the lack of an active training program a problem for their organizations, appears to be supported as well, however, neighborhood group leaders may not be consciously aware of the link between training and the problems they noted.

For example, 76.7% felt adequately prepared for their role in their group (Table 36), 36.6% felt previous life experiences gave them enough preparation for their group activity, 24.3% thought previous volunteer work had been helpful (Table 37), while 29.8% noted their previous life experiences was the skill they brought to their group (Table 38).

TABLE 36
Do they feel adequately prepared for their role

76.7%	yes
13.7	no
9.6	no response

TABLE 37

Experiences which prepared them for their role

1.0%	financial expertise
2.4	aware of current issues
2.7	interpersonal skills
7.2	previous work in groups
9.6	management background
24.3	previous volunteer work
36.6	life
16.2	no response

TABLE 38

Skills they bring to their group

.7%	sales
2.7	action oriented
4.5	financial
5.5	familiarity with government
8.6	business
9.2	communication
13.7	planning and organizing
15.4	leadership
29.8	life experiences
9.9	no response

As reported earlier (Table 26), when asked what their group should do next, only 1.4% responded that they should get some training and only 5.8% noted they would need additional training to help the group move forward (Table 27). However, Table 39 shows a variety of areas in which respondents thought training would increase their comfort level in their roles.

TABLE 39

Additional training or information needed to increase comfort in role

.3%	leadership skills
1.0	organizational training
1.7	education on economic development
2.1	computer skills
2.1	public speaking
2.7	conflict management
5.1	financial training
5.5	unsure
13.0	an understanding of the city's organization and roles
15.4	none
15.8	board member training
35.3	no response

Although there were not large numbers of respondents noting a need for training, dissatisfactions were noted with their groups (Table 25) and in written comments respondents voiced concerns that their groups were sometimes stymied by internal conflict and fighting, and that members did not always know how to voice disagreements in a respectful manner which would allow continued discussion. Some respondents felt individuals in their groups were trying to promote personal agendas versus working towards consensus or group goals.

The complaints about long meetings, too much process, and dissatisfaction with irrelevant issues, interpersonal conflicts, and personal agendas, indicate there might be more efficient or effective ways for groups to run their meetings and that training would be useful.

OTHER RELEVANT FINDINGS

Beyond exploring the hypotheses, an additional goal of this survey was to learn more about the individuals providing leadership to neighborhood groups and how they spent their time related to their groups. The following summarizes the relevant findings.

Nearly 75% of the respondents were between the ages of 25 and 54 (Table 40). Census data for Minneapolis reports those ages to be less than 50% of the general population (Table 41). When gender was correlated to their age, only slight differences were found between male and female respondents (Table 42).

TABLE 40

Age

.0%	under 18
1.0	18-24
51.0	25-44
23.3	45-54
12.7	55-64
11.6	65 or older
.3	no response

TABLE 41

Age of Minneapolis residents (Bureau of the Census, 1991)

20.4%	under 18
13.7	18-24
39.1	25-44
7.7	45-54
6.2	55-64
12.9	65 or older

TABLE 42

Gender correlated to age

	male	female
age		
18-24	1%	1%
25-44	50%	52%
45-54	24%	22%
55-64	16%	10%
65 or >	9%	14%
no response		1%

A majority of the respondents were married (Table 43) and living in households as either couples with a child or children or as a couple without children (Table 44).

TABLE 43

Marital status

26.4%	single
61.3	married
9.6	divorced
2.1	widowed
.7	no response

TABLE 44

Household

21.6%	single adult
28.4	couple, no children
34.2	couple with child or children
5.5	single adult, with child or children
7.9	unrelated adults
.7	unrelated adults with child or children
1.4	other
.3	no response

When asked their initial reason for going to their neighborhood's meeting, respondents noted a variety of reasons (Table 15) but in their written comments approximately one third noted they initially went because one of their neighbors invited them or took them with them to the meeting.

83.2% of the respondents had held office in their neighborhood group (Table 45), 27.4% had held multiple positions (Table 46),

TABLE 45
Have they held office

83.2%	yes
16.4	no
.4	no response

TABLE 46
Offices held

6.2%	president
2.4	vice-president
6.2	treasurer
4.1	secretary
17.5	board member
13.4	committee chair
.3	staff
4.5	committee member
27.4	multiple positions
18.0	no response

Of the respondents who reported having held the office of president, vice-president, treasurer, or secretary, 95% were white. The remaining 5% was divided evenly between aleutians, american indians, and blacks. When correlating gender to those four offices, there was little difference except in the office of secretary (Table 47).

TABLE 47
Gender correlated to office

	president	vice-president	treasurer	secretary
male	16.5%	5.5%	16.5%	5.5%
female	16.5%	7.0%	16.5%	16.0%

Besides attending the neighborhood group's board meeting, nearly all of the respondents participated in a committee (Table 48), and nearly half the respondents participated in

two or more (Table 49).

TABLE 48
Committee participation

88.0%	yes
11.0	no
1.0	no response

TABLE 49
Which committees

1.0%	environmental
1.0	safety
1.0	youth
1.4	transportation
2.1	arts
3.1	special events
6.2	housing
10.6	nrp
11.6	other
46.9	multiple committees
15.1	no response

When asked what was important to them in their role in their neighborhood group, three selections stood out (Table 50): being part of the decision-making process on local issues, fulfilling an obligation to community or society, and stabilizing or improving the area in which they live or work. Making career contacts, getting media exposure, and gaining political experience appeared to be of little importance to them in their role.

TABLE 50
Important to them in their neighborhood group role

being part of the decision-making process on local issues

84.2%	yes
15.8	no

getting personal goals accomplished

35.3%	yes
64.7	no

promoting or educating about issues important to them
47.9% yes
52.1 no

feeling positive about their contributions
63.4% yes
36.6 no

meeting new people
58.9% yes
41.1 no

making career contacts
9.9% yes
90.1 no

getting media exposure
3.4% yes
96.6 no

fulfilling an obligation to community or society
80.5% yes
19.5 no

stabilizing or improving the area in which they live or work
89.7% yes
10.3 no

gaining political experience
14.7% yes
85.3 no

something else
11.6% yes
88.4 no

Most respondents spent the bulk of their time attending meetings or working in committees (Table 51). Respondents also spent a small portion of their time working on volunteer projects, reading related documents, reports, or minutes, making phone calls, supervising staff, or performing other administrative duties. Although survey findings reported neighborhood leaders are concerned about the number of people participating in their groups, very few respondents spend time recruiting new members or in fundraising to raise money to support additional staff.

TABLE 51
How they spend time committed to their neighborhood group

volunteer projects

39.0%	0-20% of their time
6.5	21-40 of their time
2.7	41-60 of their time
.3	61-80 of their time
.3	81-100 of their time
51.2	no response

going to meetings

20.5%	0-20% of their time
24.0	21-40 of their time
25.3	41-60 of their time
17.1	61-80 of their time
6.5	81-100 of their time
6.6	no response

reading related documents, reports, or minutes

62.7%	0-20% of their time
6.5	21-40 of their time
1.0	41-60 of their time
.0	61-80 of their time
.0	81-100 of their time
29.8	no response

fundraising

14.7%	0-20% of their time
1.7	21-40 of their time
.3	41-60 of their time
.0	61-80 of their time
.0	81-100 of their time
83.3	no response

making phone calls

47.3%	0-20% of their time
2.7	21-40 of their time
.7	41-60 of their time
.0	61-80 of their time
.0	81-100 of their time
49.3	no response

other administrative activity

30.5%	0-20% of their time
3.4	21-40 of their time
2.7	41-60 of their time
.3	61-80 of their time
.0	81-100 of their time
63.1	no response

recruiting new members

21.2%	0-20% of their time
.3	21-40 of their time
.0	41-60 of their time
.0	61-80 of their time
.0	81-100 of their time
78.5	no response

committee work

40.8%	0-20% of their time
14.0	21-40 of their time
4.8	41-60 of their time
1.4	61-80 of their time
.3	81-100 of their time
38.7	no response

managing staff or other volunteers

20.9%	0-20% of their time
1.4	21-40 of their time
.7	41-60 of their time
.0	61-80 of their time
.0	81-100 of their time
77.0	no response

other

4.5%	0-20% of their time
1.7	21-40 of their time
2.1	41-60 of their time
.3	61-80 of their time
.3	81-100 of their time
91.1	no response

Conclusions and Recommendations

Demographics

1,000 surveys were distributed, 292 were returned and tabulated; as stated earlier, this return rate is not high enough to prove statistically that respondents mirror the whole population of Minneapolis neighborhood leaders. The researcher acknowledges that conclusions are based on a subgroup which may not represent the whole.

The initial hypothesis, that survey respondents would generally be white, middle or upper-class, homeowing, women proved only partially correct. Results indicate that a typical neighborhood leader would be a white, homeowner, with twice the household income of most Minneapolis residents, but that they were just as likely to be male as female. In fact, other than the difference in personal income levels, there was little difference due to gender. Both sexes had held the offices of President, Vice-President, and Treasurer, although twice as many females had held the position of Secretary.

Although whites represented 78% of the population of Minneapolis, 93.5% of the respondents were white. As the literature review identified, minority or low-income populations may not have a history of joining or being interested in organized neighborhood groups. There were also few respondents who were renters, only 8.6%

compared to 87% for homeowners. It appears that getting minorities or other under-represented groups, such as renters, to participate would not only take a willingness to be open to others but also a concerted effort by existing membership to seek out and draw these individuals into the group.

Other demographic information was identified as well. Respondents were typically employed, although their jobs were in too many fields to categorize; most individuals were 25-54 years old; and households of couples or couples with children were in the majority. In the area of education, nearly 70% of respondents had achieved a college degree or gone onto graduate work whereas generally only 22% of Minneapolis residents attained that level.

According to annual Citizen Participation Agreement Assessments returned to the Minneapolis Community Development Agency for 1995, most Minneapolis neighborhood groups already announce coming meetings with ads in their local community newspapers, and many mail or deliver newsletters and flyers to all neighborhood residents and businesses. Neighborhood groups interested in expanding their membership to under-represented groups might need to find other ways to announce their meetings and attract new members. Some ways to do so might be to identify publications which get to the targeted groups and place ads for the group or group announcements in them, to attend meetings of special populations and interest groups to try to network with them and interest them in attending the neighborhood group

meetings, or to try a face-to-face or door-knocking campaign in which under-represented individuals are sought out and invited to come to a meeting and join the neighborhood group.

Members' Relationship to the Neighborhood and Their Group

The majority of respondents had lived five or more years in Minneapolis, lived within the boundaries of their neighborhood group, and had been in their group longer than one year. About 20% of the respondents were new members, having been in their group less than one year.

The second hypothesis was that individuals would probably report that they were prompted to participate by a concern for their property values and the safety of their neighborhoods over a sense of duty to their community. Although nearly 25% said they initially went to a neighborhood meeting because of concern about their neighborhood and their desire to protect it, many other reasons for going were cited. These included an interest in a specific issue, a desire to contribute to society or to be a good citizen, and curiosity. Reasons for continuing in the group included enjoying the other members, interest in the projects, a continuing desire to preserve the neighborhood, and wanting to contribute to their community. Although the literature review suggested individuals were more likely to participate from concern over their property values than over a sense of

duty, this was not supported by these survey results.

Neighborhood groups might keep in mind that specific issues could draw new people to their groups and be sure to advertise their work on an issue in any publicized meeting announcements.

Retaining Members

A third hypothesis was that the survey would find neighborhood group work was done by a small group of people and that, more than likely, they would report concern over the time required and membership burnout. This hypothesis proved valid. Respondents (21.6%) noted burnout and too much time needed as reasons they might leave their group, 14% felt getting more volunteers to share the workload would encourage them to stay in their group, and nearly half the respondents reported being on several committees at one time, while 36.3% indicated they would like to take on less responsibility. Nearly half (45.2%) reported their biggest dissatisfaction with their group was that it took too much time to participate and go through the process and that there were too few people involved.

While 28.1% listed attracting more members to their group as the next priority and 23.3%

noted getting more people as the support they would need to accomplish their group's goals, only 21.2% noted that they spent any time recruiting new members and those respondents spent only a small portion of their total time, 0-20%, doing it.

One key to attracting new members might have been revealed in the survey responses. Although 13.7% noted being invited as the reason they initially went to a meeting, many other respondents noted in their written comments that the first time they went to a meeting, they went with a neighbor who was already a member and brought them along. Groups interested in growing their membership might try a strategy which includes asking each existing member to bring someone new each meeting or at least to a few especially interesting or fun meetings every year.

Of importance to respondents was feeling positive about their contribution (63.4 percent) and fulfilling an obligation to society (80.5 percent). As 33.9 percent noted they wanted to, or felt they should, contribute as their reason for deciding to actively participate in their group, one strategy might be to immediately ask new people to help with some small task or project the first time they come to a meeting. Getting them to agree to a task, showing them they are needed, and exhibiting appreciation for their participation might encourage them to make a commitment to return to the next meeting.

Neighborhood groups might also consider linking program or project benefits to participation in their group. For instance, residents who receive financial benefits from a

neighborhood fix and paint program might be required to attend two or three meetings before they receive payment. They might hear something at the meetings which would interest them and encourage them to continue participating. Requiring participation on projects might also allow tasks to be broken up into smaller commitments which take less time and energy for those who regularly volunteer.

To reduce the demands on existing members, groups might want to spend time developing more formalized strategies in which they prioritize their objectives and try to focus on fewer projects at a time. Neighborhood groups might also be able to identify other organizations they could join with on certain projects and share resources. For instance, a neighborhood group might have the financial resources to pay for the purchase of new athletic equipment for their neighborhood park program. In return, they might ask the coaches and participant's parents connected with one of the park's athletic teams to pick out and order the equipment, and to assemble or install it. Neighborhood group newsletters or flyers might be distributed by a local boys' or girls' club or combined with information going out from the neighborhood block clubs in return for some other favor.

Training Programs

The final hypothesis was that various levels of skill would be required for the many

activities neighborhood groups are contracted to perform, but that there would probably be few organizations with formalized training programs in place. This proved valid.

Respondents had a variety of backgrounds and skill levels and 36.6% thought their previous life experience was enough to adequately prepare them for their role in the group. Many (24.3%) thought their experience in earlier volunteer work was helpful. Over half (53.4%) had not received any training from their group, 50.7% had not received any from the city, although 31.2% noted they had received training related to a specific program such as the Neighborhood Revitalization Program. Although many respondents noted getting training through reading, school classes, experiences in their workplace, and networking with others, 37.7% noted finding no training on their own.

When asked what support the group would need to move forward, only 5.8% of respondents noted training, and in other questions, 76.7% felt adequately prepared, although 13.0% noted they wanted to understand more about the city's role and city government, and 15.8% thought their board could use further training.

Although there were not large numbers of respondents noting a need for training, complaints about long meetings, too much process, and dissatisfaction with irrelevant issues, interpersonal conflicts, and personal agendas, indicate there might be more efficient or effective ways for groups to run their meetings and that training would be useful. If neighborhood groups become more successful in attracting a more diverse

membership, they might find training on multi-culturalism and group process a good way to begin to learn to understand their individual needs and to work together.

As respondents reported most of their time was spent going to meetings and attending to committee work, neighborhood groups might want to focus some training on how to run and participate in an effective meeting. To begin, they might discuss, formulate, and post ground rules for respectful interactions so individuals are clear on when they "have the floor" and when it is time to listen to someone else, and they could agree on what kind of comments are appropriate and what kind will not be acceptable to the group. They might also devise a system for ensuring less outspoken individuals are asked for their ideas while more outspoken members are prevented from monopolizing too much time.

To prevent focus on personal agendas, groups could work from a mutually agreed upon meeting agenda that is created at the end of each previous meeting or decided at the beginning of the current one. Agendas could be handed out or written on a chalk or dry marker board so everyone is clear on the focus of that meeting. If meeting participants bring up topics which appear to veer from the agreed upon agenda, everyone could agree to "park" that topic. They could write it down on a list so it is not forgotten and agree to come back to it later when they can decide to discuss it or put it on the next meeting's agenda. The president of the group or the chair of a committee could be charged with holding members accountable to the ground rules the group set. If an individual does not appear to understand or respect the group's rules, they could be

appropriately redirected during the meeting or be counseled in private later.

A majority, 89.7%, of respondents noted it was important to them to stabilize or improve the area in which they live or work. To ensure this need is met, groups might want to focus some effort on a strategic plan which outlines their group's mission and goals and review it periodically to see if their work is getting the results they want.

Group board members, in particular, are responsible and accountable for ensuring the activities they have contracted to do are done. They may have to oversee, and therefore understand, responsibilities which may include hiring and supervising staff, appropriately managing money and maintaining good financial records, filing taxes, getting and maintaining a non-profit status, handling grievances, and getting appropriate insurance for the group, their employees, and any special events.

These responsibilities may require specialized knowledge and a commitment to stay informed about changes required by law or by the terms of the group's contract with the MCDA. Some board members may not have experience in these areas. New members, in particular, may not realize these responsibilities exist. One solution may be for each neighborhood group to have an annual training meeting for their board members to review their contract with the city, bylaws, grievance policy, financial records, insurance contracts, nonprofit status, and any relevant topics. They could also discuss their individual roles as officers and agree to guidelines about conduct when speaking as a

representative of the group.

If the group has hired staff, an employee could be charged with keeping the group informed about these issues. If the group does not have staff, the vice-president might be a good choice for keeping the group informed. It might be helpful for the group to keep a three-ring binder with relevant documents in it to assist the group in understanding previous actions taken and any obligations they need to fulfill. It might be a good idea to assign one of the board members to be an education chair with the role of keeping group members informed about training classes available through the city or other community resources. Education announcements could be a standard agenda item for the group's meetings. Members who attend classes could be asked to briefly share what they learned to help other members decide if they should attend too.

The literature review indicated that groups could gain wider community support by keeping their organization open to everyone and by ensuring people's psychological needs were met. One way for a group to check on their performance would be to routinely ask members how they feel about the group, its activities, and they way in which they are performed. Post-meeting reviews, either oral or written, might be useful in highlighting what is working well and what could be improved. Annually, the group might want to review its accomplishments and compare them to its strategic plan for the same purpose.

Summary

Literature reviewed for this research led to the formation of several hypotheses for this study. The first hypothesis was that a survey of Minneapolis neighborhood organization leaders would find white, middle or upper income, college graduate, homeowning, women in the majority and that this group would not be representative of the population of Minneapolis residents.

To ensure the anonymity of respondents, the survey instrument did not ask them to identify their neighborhood group or the Minneapolis community in which they lived. Therefore, without a 100% response rate, it cannot be concluded that responses were received from each neighborhood group or from each Minneapolis community. Respondents may or may not reflect the demographics of their particular neighborhood.

However, the responses could be compared to demographics for the population of Minneapolis. When these comparisons were made, results similar to those reported by the Star Tribune (1995), Martin & Goodard (1989), Friedman (1989), Logan & Molotch (1987), Davidson (1979), and Fessler (1976) continued to be confirmed. Minneapolis neighborhood group leaders were, as were other studies' community leaders, typically white, middle or upper income, homeowners, with college degrees. The only part of Hypothesis 1 which was disproved was that the respondents would be overwhelmingly

female. In this study, respondents were equally male and female and that was reflective of the population of Minneapolis.

Hypothesis 1 was useful in identifying that minorities, low income groups, renters, and people of lower educational attainment, continue to make up only a small percentage of leadership within Minneapolis neighborhood organizations. Future researchers might want to investigate whether this negatively impacts the interests of those under-represented, or whether, as Jones (1987) and the Citizen League (1983) suggested, neighborhood leaders are able to identify and represent the concerns and interests of their whole community.

As Minneapolis neighborhood organizations contracted with the MCDA pledge to seek members and leadership which reflect their community, the MCDA might want to survey contracted groups to find out how successfully this goal has been met. The MCDA could share successful strategies with all of the neighborhood groups and encourage greater community outreach.

Earlier works by Fessler (1976) and Friedman (1989) suggested Hypothesis 2, that neighborhood leaders would report their motivation for becoming, and staying involved in their groups, stemmed from concern for their property values and the safety of their neighborhoods rather than from a sense of duty to their community.

Although declining neighborhood conditions, which could lead to lower property values, and safety issues were clearly among the concerns of survey respondents, they also identified curiosity, being invited, wanting to be a good citizen, and feeling a need to contribute as reasons they started going to their groups. When asked why they stayed involved, the overwhelming response was that they enjoyed their relationship with other members and that they felt positive about the projects on which their group was working.

Hypothesis 2 suggested that neighborhood group leaders' motivations would be far more self-focused and materialistic than the actual responses indicated. This study's respondents appear to be more community focused than those reported on in earlier studies and they appear to be hungry for the social interactions and good works provided by their group. Further exploration of these desires may prove valuable in gaining information which would help neighborhood groups attract and retain additional members.

Wattenberg (1979) reported a high burnout rate among individuals participating in community groups. She noted that citizen involvement takes a great deal of time, requires a tolerance for frustration, and that a small pool of people typically perform their group's required tasks. Her work prompted the third hypothesis, that neighborhood group leaders would indicate concern over the time required in connection with their group and that they would indicate burnout as a primary reason they would stop participating.

Hypothesis 3 was clearly supported by survey results. Throughout their responses, individuals complained about the number of meetings they had to attend, the slow progress they were making toward their goals, the amount of time they were expected to contribute, and their frustrations with the whole process. Among individuals replying to questions about what their group needed or what it should do next, the answer was clearly *get more people involved in the group and in volunteering in the tasks.*

The findings of this research indicate that burnout is indeed a serious concern among Minneapolis neighborhood group leaders and likely to be the reason many of them leave their organizations. The results also indicate it would be beneficial if groups researched more efficient methods for holding meetings and working on projects. What this research does not uncover, however, is a way to guarantee an increase in membership or a strategy which encourages more members to share tasks. Another area which could be further explored is whether losing leadership to burnout is a negative consequence. There may be beneficial consequences to member and leadership turnover. It might be discovered that the neighborhood organization's very survival requires it.

Work by Hult (1984) and Cunningham & Kotler (1983) suggested the first part of the final hypothesis, that few neighborhood groups would have an active training program in place for their membership and that few individuals would have participated in available training programs. This part of the hypothesis was supported by survey results. Less than 10% of the respondents noted receiving training from their neighborhood group and

nearly 40% reported they had not received any training.

The second half of the fourth hypothesis predicted that respondents would make observations that the lack of a formal training program was a problem for their organizations. This part of the hypothesis appeared to be supported as well although neighborhood leaders might not be able to connect the problems their groups are having with a lack of training.

On one hand, most respondents felt prepared for their role in their group and many cited previous life experience as enough preparation for their group's activities. On the other hand, there were numerous complaints that their groups were stymied by internal conflict and fighting, sidetracked by irrelevant issues or the promotion of personal agendas, and spending too much time in meetings or processes where nothing much got accomplished. Perhaps it takes an outsider to see that everyone seems to be saying that it is the other guy who is the problem and to identify that ground rules for group behavior, efficient methods for running meetings, and education in leadership and conflict management are areas which could easily be addressed within an organization's training program.

Appendices

Appendix A

Phone Guide for Conversations with Neighborhood Group Chairpersons

- Introduce myself as an Augsburg graduate student

- Explain:
  I am doing research on leaders within Minneapolis neighborhood groups for my thesis for a Masters in Leadership from Augsburg

  the project involves a survey of leaders within Minneapolis neighborhood groups recognized by the MCDA

  the project has the approval of the Minneapolis Community Development Agency (MCDA) and the Augsburg Institutional Review Board

  the survey includes questions to collect information on these leaders' demographics as well as information on their reasons for joining, staying in their organizations, and what they believe is needed as far as further training

  the survey would take people about 15 minutes to complete and the information is going to be collected in such a way as to keep the identity of individuals unknown

  the findings of my project will be available for their group as well as the MCDA and other organizations

  the surveys will arrive with a detailed cover letter attached as well as a preaddressed, stamped return envelope

- Ask:
  would they be willing to put this topic on their next meeting's agenda and distribute the survey to their leadership at that meeting?

  how many surveys do they think they will need?

  confirm their name, address, and title for the Chairperson cover letter

- Thank them for their time and assistance and let them know how soon they will receive the surveys

Appendix B

Letter to Chairpersons

Date

Chairperson
Minneapolis Neighborhood Group
(Letters were addressed and personalized after a phone conversation with each Chairperson.)

Dear Chairperson:

As we discussed in our phone conversation, here are copies of the survey I am using to collect information on leadership within Minneapolis neighborhood groups.

Please distribute a copy to each of your board members, committee chairs, and other people who play a significant role in your organization. Don't forget to take one for yourself. When you hand out the surveys, please stress the following details:

- the information is being collected in such a way that they will remain anonymous and no one will be able to track their responses back to them

- completing the survey should only take about 15 minutes

- the findings of my research will be available to your group later and, hopefully, provide you with information on what attracts and keeps people participating in neighborhood groups

Each survey has a letter explaining the project in detail and a preaddressed and stamped return envelope.

Again, thank you for agreeing to help me with this project. I will make sure the results are available to your group as soon as I can get them ready.

If you have any questions, please call me at 452-1499 extension 3002 weekdays or 788-2571 evenings.

Sincerely,

Stephanie Anderson

Appendix C

Letter of Instruction to Each Neighborhood Group Member

Dear Minneapolis Neighborhood Group Member:
As someone active in your neighborhood group, you know how important it is to try to keep Minneapolis a great place to live and work. You also know how hard it sometimes is to get others to volunteer their time and energy to help.

I am conducting a study of Minneapolis neighborhood group leaders, like yourself, for my thesis towards a Masters in Leadership from Augsburg College. I will be gathering information on your backgrounds, the work you are doing, why you got involved, what keeps you involved, and what training might be needed to keep neighborhood group efforts successful. As far as I can tell, this information is not available anywhere else. You were selected because you participate in a neighborhood group recognized in the Minneapolis Community Development Agency's (MCDA) Neighborhood Guide.

My hope is that this study will provide information which may be used to attract more people to neighborhood groups and to their projects. I intend to share results with any interested neighborhood group and I have been asked to provide results to the MCDA and to the Center for Urban and Regional Affairs which is affiliated with the University of Minnesota.

I know you're already a busy person, but I'm asking you to participate by taking about fifteen minutes to fill out the attached survey and mail it back to me in the stamped and preaddressed return envelope. This study has been approved by the Institutional Review Board at Augsburg College; the approval number is 95-06-3.

There is no risk to you. You won't be identified by your name or the name of your neighborhood group and the original surveys will be kept private and in a locked file. They will be destroyed upon completion of my thesis.

Of course, participation in this study is voluntary; and choosing not to participate will not affect your current or future relationship with Augsburg College, your neighborhood group, or me. You may choose to skip any question you are not comfortable answering or you may choose to withdraw from the study by not filling out or returning the survey.

If you have any questions or comments, you may call me during the day at 452-1499 extension 3002 or evenings at 788-2571. My advisor's name is Professor Garry Hesser. He can be reached at Augsburg College at 330-1000. Please save this letter for your records in case you have any questions in the future.

Appendix D

Survey of Leadership – Minneapolis Neighborhood Groups

Thank you for participating.

Please check those responses which best describe your answer. Where written responses are required, please be honest and speak your mind.

Remember, this study is voluntary; choosing not to participate will not affect your current or future relationship with Augsburg College, your neighborhood group, or the researcher. You may choose to skip any question you are not comfortable answering or choose to withdraw from the study by not filling out or returning the survey.

Personal Demographics

There is a possibility some respondents could be identified by their answers to demographic questions but this information will be used for classification purposes only and will be kept confidential.

1. You are:

❑ male ❑ female

❑ self employed ❑ unemployed
❑ employed part-time ❑ employed full-time
❑ homemaker ❑ retired
❑ employed student ❑ unemployed student

If currently employed, what is your occupation? _____

❑ renter ❑ homeowner ❑ other *(please explain)* _____

❑ younger than 18 ❑ 18-24 ❑ 25-44 ❑ 45-54
❑ 55-64 ❑ 65 or older

❑ single ❑ married ❑ divorced ❑ widowed

❑ Aleutian ❑ American Indian ❑ Asian ❑ Black ❑ Eskimo
❑ Hispanic ❑ Pacific Islander ❑ White ❑ Other _____

2. Which of the following best describes your household?

- ❑ Single adult
- ❑ Couple, with child or children
- ❑ Unrelated adults
- ❑ Other
- ❑ Couple, no children
- ❑ Single adult, with child or children
- ❑ Unrelated adults, with child or children

3. What was your personal income in 1994, before taxes?

- ❑ under $20,000
- ❑ $20,000 - $29,999
- ❑ $30,000 - $39,999
- ❑ $40,000 - $49,999
- ❑ $50,000 - $59,999
- ❑ $60,000 - $99,999
- ❑ $100,000 or more

4. What was your total household income in 1994, before taxes?

- ❑ under $20,000
- ❑ $20,000 - $29,999
- ❑ $30,000 - $39,999
- ❑ $40,000 - $49,999
- ❑ $50,000 - $59,999
- ❑ $60,000 - $99,999
- ❑ $100,000 or more

5. What is the highest level of education you have completed?

- ❑ Some high school
- ❑ High school
- ❑ Some technical school
- ❑ Technical school(s)
- ❑ Some college
- ❑ Associate's degree(s)
- ❑ Bachelor's degree(s)
- ❑ Some graduate level work
- ❑ Graduate degree(s)
- ❑ Ph.D.(s)

If you have education past high school, what was your major field of study? _____

Relationship to the Neighborhood and Neighborhood Group

6. If you have not lived in Minneapolis all your life, how long have you lived here?

7. Do you live within the geographic boundaries recognized by your neighborhood group? ❑ Yes ❑ No

8. Do you work in that neighborhood? ❑ Yes ❑ No

9. Do you own property in that neighborhood? ❑ Yes ❑ No

If you own, is the property ❑ residential or ❑ commercial?

10. How long have you been active in your neighborhood group?

11. Why did you start going to your neighborhood meetings?

12. What made you decide to actively participate in the group?

13. How much longer do you think you will be active in your neighborhood group?

- ❑ Uncertain
- ❑ 3 to 5 years
- ❑ 10 to 15 years
- ❑ Less than 3 years
- ❑ 6 to 9 years
- ❑ 15 or more years

14. Why would you leave the group?

15. What would encourage you to stay in the group?

Community Activities

16. Have you held, or do you hold, an official position in your neighborhood group? ❑ Yes ❑ No

If yes, which offices have you held? _____

17. Do you participate in any of your group's committees? ❑ Yes ❑ No

If yes, which ones? _____

18. Do you currently participate in other volunteer or community groups? ❑ Yes ❑ No

If yes, which types of groups are they?

- ❑ Environmental
- ❑ Political
- ❑ Religious
- ❑ Service
- ❑ Youth focused
- ❑ Other *(please explain)* _____

19. How many volunteer groups have you participated in over the past five years?

20. In how many volunteer groups do you currently have a leadership position?

21. What concerns do you have about your community?

The Neighborhood Group

22. What satisfies you about your neighborhood group?

23. What dissatisfies you about your neighborhood group?

24. Would you like to take on more or less responsibility? Why and what stops you?

25. What is important to you in your role within your neighborhood group?
(Please check any that apply.)

- ❑ Being part of the decision-making process on local issues
- ❑ Getting some of my personal goals accomplished
- ❑ Promoting or educating about issues that are important to me
- ❑ Feeling positive about my contributions
- ❑ Meeting new people
- ❑ Making career contacts
- ❑ Getting media exposure
- ❑ Fulfilling an obligation to my community or society as a whole
- ❑ Stabilizing or improving the area in which I live or work
- ❑ Gaining political experience
- ❑ Something else *(If you choose this, please explain)* _____

26. In percentages, how do you spend the time you commit to your neighborhood group?
(Please make the total equal 100%.)

_____Volunteer projects
_____Going to meetings
_____Reading related documents, reports, or minutes
_____Fundraising
_____Making phone calls
_____Other administrative activity
_____Recruiting new members
_____Committee work
_____Managing staff or other volunteers
_____Other *(Please list activities if you pick this category)* _____

27. Is your neighborhood group accomplishing something worthwhile?

28. What else should they be doing?

29. What support would you need to move them in that direction?

Training

30. What skills and talents do you think you bring to the neighborhood group?

31. Do you feel adequately prepared for your role within your group? Why or why not?

32. What experiences have helped to prepare you for this role?

33. What additional training or information would you need to feel more comfortable in your role?

34. What training, if any, has your neighborhood organization given you?

35. What training, if any, has the city given you?

36. What training, if any, have you found on your own?

37. Is there anything else you would like to add?

That's it. Thank you for sticking it out. I will make survey results available to your group this spring.

Please put your completed survey into the pre-addressed return envelope and mail it as soon as you are able.

Appendix E

Survey Responses

Responses are reported in percentages and a category named "no response" was added, when necessary, to allow each question's responses to total 292 or 100%.

Personal Demographics

Gender

50%	male
50	female

Census data for Minneapolis (Bureau of the Census, 1991) reported the population as 49% male and 51% female.

Employment

21.6%	self employed
1.4	unemployed
7.9	employed part-time
45.5	employed full-time
4.5	homemaker
10.3	retired
.7	employed student
1.0	unemployed student
7.2	no response

Current Employment

The number of responses to this question was small and occupations did not fall into patterns which allowed reliable grouping. Artists, cabinet makers, government employees, lawyers, managers, nurses, salespersons, and teachers were representative but many respondents choose not to answer the question.

Housing

8.6%	renter
87.0	homeowner
2.7	other
1.7	no response

Age

.0%	under 18
1.0	18-24
51.0	25-44
23.3	45-54
12.7	55-64
11.6	65 or older
.3	no response

Census data for Minneapolis (Bureau of the Census, 1991) reported the following distributions:

Age

20.4%	*under 18*
13.7	*18-24*
39.1	*25-44*
7.7	*45-54*
6.2	*55-64*
12.9	*65 or older*

When correlating gender to age, only slight differences were found between male and female respondents. See results below:

	male	female
age		
18-24	1%	1%
25-44	50%	52%
45-54	24%	22%
55-64	16%	10%
65 or >	9%	14%
no response	1%	

Marital Status

26.4%	single
61.3	married
9.6	divorced
2.1	widowed
.7	no response

Race

.3%	aleutian
.7	american indian
.3	asian
.7	black
.0	eskimo
1.0	hispanic
.0	pacific islander
93.5	white
1.0	other
2.4	no response

Census data for Minneapolis (Bureau of the Census, 1991) reported the following distributions:

Race

3%	*aleutian, american indian, eskimo*
4	*asian, pacific islander*
13	*black*
78	*white*
2	*other*

Household

21.6%	single adult
28.4	couple, no children
34.2	couple with child or children
5.5	single adult, with child or children
7.9	unrelated adults
.7	unrelated adults with child or children
1.4	other
.3	no response

Personal Income

24.3%	under $20,000
15.8	$20,000 - $29,999
19.9	$30,000 - $39,999
10.6	$40,000 - $49,999
9.6	$50,000 - $59,999
8.2	$60,000 - $99,999
4.1	$100,000 or more
7.5	no response

When correlating gender to personal income, income for male respondents was more evenly distributed than income for female respondents, and females reported lower incomes. See results below:

	male	female
<$20,000	13%	36%
20-29,999	13%	18%
30-39,999	23%	17%
40-49,999	15%	6%
50-59,999	12%	8%
60-99,999	10%	6%
100->	7%	1%
no response	7%	8%

Household Income

8.2%	under $20,000
9.9	$20,000 - $29,999
16.4	$30,000 - $39,999
13.0	$40,000 - $49,999
12.3	$50,000 - $59,999
24.7	$60,000 - $99,999
8.9	$100,000 or more
6.5	no response

Survey respondents indicate a median household income between $50,000 and $59,999. The County and City Data Book (Bureau of the Census, 1994) listed median household income for Minneapolis as $25,324.

When correlating gender to household income, household income for female respondents is more evenly distributed than their personal income. See results below:

	male	female
<$20,000	10%	7%
20-29,999	6%	14%
30-39,999	12%	20%
40-49,999	14%	12%
50-59,999	15%	9%
60-99,999	29%	21%
100->	8%	10%
no response	6%	7%

Completed Education

.7%	some high school
5.1	high school
1.0	some technical school
3.4	technical school/s
16.8	some college
3.1	associate degree/s
26.7	bachelor degree/s
14.7	some graduate level work
24.0	graduate degree/s
3.4	PhD./s
1.0	no response

Educational attainment for Minnesotans aged 25 or older, as reported in the Statistical Abstract of the United States (Bureau of the Census, 1994), indicates neighborhood group survey respondents achieved a higher level of education than most Minnesotans.

Educational Attainment for Minnesotans 25 or Older

17.6%	*did not graduate high school*
33.0	*high school graduate*
19.0	*some college*
8.6	*associate degree*
15.6	*bachelor degree*
6.2	*graduate degree*

Major Field of Study

The response rate to this question was small and answers did not fall into patterns which allowed reliable groupings.

Relationship to the Neighborhood and Neighborhood Group

Years Lived in Minneapolis

1.4%	0-1 year
11.3	>1-5 years
10.3	>5-10 years
61.0	>10 years
16.1	no response

Reside within Neighborhood Group's Boundaries

93.2%	yes
6.5	no
.3	no response

Work within Same Neighborhood

33.9%	yes
63.0	no
3.1	no response

Own Property in the Neighborhood

87.0%	yes
12.3	no
.7	no response

Property Type

83.6%	residential
1.0	commercial
1.7	both
13.7	no response

Years Active in Neighborhood Group

19.9%	0-1 year
51.0	>1-5 years
15.4	>5-10 years
13.4	>10 years
.3	no response

Initial Reason for Going to Neighborhood Meetings

.3%	for their children
2.1	multiple reasons
2.7	to participate in committee work
5.5	wanted to be a good citizen
13.7	invited by someone else
14.0	a single issue
15.1	had a desire to contribute
16.4	curious to see what was going on
26.4	wanted to protect their neighborhood
3.8	no response

Reason for Deciding to Actively Participate in the Group

2.1%	multiple reasons
3.1	other
5.8	saw a need to add diversity
6.8	the people participating
11.6	projects the group worked on
12.7	was asked
18.2	to help preserve the neighborhood
33.9	wanted to contribute
5.8	no response

How Many More Years They Anticipate Staying in the Group

43.2%	uncertain
11.3	<3 years
17.5	3-5 years
5.8	6-9 years
4.8	10-15 years
16.4	15 or more years
1.0	no response

Why They Would Leave the Group

1.0%	unsure
4.1	leave to open spaces for others
4.5	group's goals or focus changed
5.5	group was not accomplishing anything
6.8	to do other things
6.8	conflict in the group
7.5	multiple reasons
8.6	burnout
9.6	death
13.0	too much time needed
27.7	move out of the neighborhood
4.8	no response

Why They Would Stay in the Group

1.6%	concern over conflicting goals in the group
1.7	have the group attend training
2.4	less time is required
2.4	unsure
2.7	neighborhood continues to improve
6.8	multiple reasons
6.8	compensation or appreciation
8.9	I'm just staying
14.0	more volunteers are attracted to help
38.0	the people and the continuing success of the projects
14.7	no response

Community Activities

Have They Held Office

83.2%	yes
16.4	no
.4	no response

Offices Held

6.2%	president
2.4	vice-president
6.2	treasurer
4.1	secretary
17.5	board member
13.4	committee chair
.3	staff
4.5	committee member
27.4	multiple positions
18.0	no response

Of the respondents who reported having held the office of president, vice-president, treasurer, or secretary, 95% were white. The remaining 5% was divided evenly between aleutians, american indians, and blacks.

When correlating gender to those four offices, the office of secretary indicated the greatest difference between respondents. See below:

	president	vice-president	treasurer	secretary
male	16.5%	5.5%	16.5%	5..5%
female	16.5%	7.0%	16.5%	16.0%

Committee Participation

88.0%	yes
11.0	no
1.0	no response

Which Committees

1.0%	environmental
1.0	safety
1.0	youth
1.4	transportation
2.1	arts
3.1	special events
6.2	housing
10.6	nrp
11.6	other
46.9	multiple committees
15.1	no response

Participation in Other Volunteer or Community Groups

75.7%	yes
21.2	no
3.1	no response

Types of Other Groups

3.4%	environmental
6.2	political
5.5	religious
4.5	service
3.4	youth focused
12.0	other
41.8	multiple groups
23.2	no response

Number of Volunteer Groups in Past Five Years

3.0%	none
10.3	one
12.7	two
17.1	three
13.7	four
36.0	five or more
7.2	no response

Volunteer Groups in Which They Hold Leadership Positions

17.1%	none
30.8	one
28.8	two
9.6	three
3.1	four
3.4	five or more
7.2	no response

Concerns About Their Community

.7%	schools
1.0	discrimination
1.7	lack of diversity
1.7	environmental
1.7	youth
3.1	inadequate community control
6.2	economic conditions
7.2	declining housing
9.2	apathy, no commitment
15.8	crime, safety
20.2	multiple concern
22.9	neighborhood decline
8.6	no response

The Neighborhood Group

Satisfaction With Neighborhood Group

1.0%	the improving neighborhood
1.4	multiple responses
4.5	diversity
28.1	successful projects
55.5	the people and sense of community
9.5	no response

Dissatisfaction With Neighborhood Group

2.4%	lack of diversity
3.1	multiple responses
4.1	the relationship with the city
5.1	irrelevant issues
6.8	nothing
8.6	conflicts
14.0	personal agendas
18.5	too much process or time spent
26.7	too few people involved
10.7	no response

Wish to Take on More or Less Responsibility

18.8%	more
36.3	less
34.9	stay at same level
10.0	no response

Respondents who wished to take on more responsibility frequently noted that they were unable to because of the amount of time their current responsibilities already take.

Respondents who wished to reduce their level of responsibility frequently noted their current responsibilities already take too much time.

Important to Them in Their Neighborhood Group Role

being part of the decision-making process on local issues

84.2%	yes
15.8	no

getting personal goals accomplished
35.3% yes
64.7 no

promoting or educating about issues important to them
47.9% yes
52.1 no

feeling positive about their contributions
63.4% yes
36.6 no

meeting new people
58.9% yes
41.1 no

making career contacts
9.9% yes
90.1 no

getting media exposure
3.4% yes
96.6 no

fulfilling an obligation to community or society
80.5% yes
19.5 no

stabilizing or improving the area in which they live or work
89.7% yes
10.3 no

gaining political experience
14.7% yes
85.3 no

something else
11.6% yes
88.4 no

How They Spend Time Committed to Their Neighborhood Group

volunteer projects

39.0%	0-20% of their time
6.5	21-40 of their time
2.7	41-60 of their time
.3	61-80 of their time
.3	81-100 of their time
51.2	no response

going to meetings

20.5%	0-20% of their time
24.0	21-40 of their time
25.3	41-60 of their time
17.1	61-80 of their time
6.5	81-100 of their time
6.6	no response

reading related documents, reports, or minutes

62.7%	0-20% of their time
6.5	21-40 of their time
1.0	41-60 of their time
.0	61-80 of their time
.0	81-100 of their time
29.8	no response

fundraising

14.7%	0-20% of their time
1.7	21-40 of their time
.3	41-60 of their time
.0	61-80 of their time
.0	81-100 of their time
83.3	no response

making phone calls

47.3%	0-20% of their time
2.7	21-40 of their time
.7	41-60 of their time
.0	61-80 of their time
.0	81-100 of their time
49.3	no response

other administrative activity

30.5%	0-20% of their time
3.4	21-40 of their time
2.7	41-60 of their time
.3	61-80 of their time
.0	81-100 of their time
63.1	no response

recruiting new members

21.2%	0-20% of their time
.3	21-40 of their time
.0	41-60 of their time
.0	61-80 of their time
.0	81-100 of their time
78.5	no response

committee work

40.8%	0-20% of their time
14.0	21-40 of their time
4.8	41-60 of their time
1.4	61-80 of their time
.3	81-100 of their time
38.7	no response

managing staff or other volunteers

20.9%	0-20% of their time
1.4	21-40 of their time
.7	41-60 of their time
.0	61-80 of their time
.0	81-100 of their time
77.0	no response

other

4.5%	0-20% of their time
1.7	21-40 of their time
2.1	41-60 of their time
.3	61-80 of their time
.3	81-100 of their time
91.1	no response

Is Their Group Accomplishing Something Worthwhile

91.4%	yes
2.1	no
4.1	unsure
2.4	no response

What Should Their Group Do Next

.3%	have more fun
.7	have less conflict
1.4	unsure
1.4	get some training
1.7	multiple responses
2.4	communicate more to the community
2.4	use less process
10.6	focus on issues
11.3	develop a strategic plan
12.7	stay as is
28.1	attract more people
27.0	no response

What Support Would the Group Need to Move Forward

1.0%	a role model
2.4	to get more organized
4.1	nothing, able as is
4.8	unsure
5.8	more training
6.8	more staff
8.2	more money
9.2	more community awareness and support
23.3	more people
34.4	no response

Training

Skills They Bring to Their Group

.7%	sales
2.7	action oriented
4.5	financial
5.5	familiarity with government
8.6	business
9.2	communication
13.7	planning and organizing
15.4	leadership
29.8	life experiences
9.9	no response

Do They Feel Adequately Prepared for Their Role

76.7%	yes
13.7	no
9.6	no response

Experiences Which Prepared Them for Their Role

1.0%	financial expertise
2.4	aware of current issues
2.7	interpersonal skills
7.2	previous work in groups
9.6	management background
24.3	previous volunteer work
36.6	life
16.2	no response

Additional Training or Information Needed to Increase Comfort in Role

.3%	leadership skills
1.0	organizational training
1.7	education on economic development
2.1	computer skills
2.1	public speaking
2.7	conflict management
5.1	financial training
5.5	unsure
13.0	an understanding of the city's organization and roles
15.4	none
15.8	board member training
35.3	no response

Training the Neighborhood Group Provided

1.4%	leadership
8.2	board member
17.8	access to city and non-profit courses
53.4	none
19.2	no response

Training the City Provided

.3%	conflict management
31.2	specific program
50.7	none
17.8	no response

Training Respondents Found on Their Own

1.0%	computer
4.8	education through their workplace
8.6	networking
17.5	reading or school classes
37.7	none
30.4	no response

Bibliography

Adams, John S. (1991). *Our changing cities.* In John Fraser Hart (Ed.), Housing submarkets in an American metropolis (chap. seven). Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Alinsky, Saul D. (1969). *Reveille for radicals.* NY: Vintage Books.

Alinsky, Saul D. (1971). *Rules for radicals.* NY: Random House, Inc.

Banerjee, Tridib, & Baer, William C. (1984). *Beyond the neighborhood unit.* NY: Plenum Press.

Belluck, Pam. (1996, February 25). In era of shrinking budgets, community groups blossom. *The New York Times*, p. 1.

Belton, Sharon Sayles. (1994, August). *Directions framework: A policy guide for budgets, management and policy development.* Minneapolis, MN: City of Minneapolis.

Berry, Brian J. L. (1985). *The new urban reality.* In Paul E. Peterson (Ed.), Islands of renewal in seas of decay. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution.

Bureau of the Census. (1991). *1990 Census of population and housing.* Washington, DC: United States Department of Commerce, Economics, and Statistical Administration.

Bureau of the Census. (1994). *County and city data book.* Washington, DC: United States Department of Commerce.

Bureau of the Census (1994). *Statistical abstract of the United States, the national data book.* Washington, DC: United States Department of Commerce, Economics, and Statistical Administration.

Citizens League, Neighborhood Services Committee. (1983). *Homegrown services: the neighborhood opportunity.* Minneapolis, MN: Citizens League.

City Planning Department. (1994). *State of the city 1993, a statistical portrait of Minneapolis.* Minneapolis, MN: City Planning Department.

Cunningham, James V., & Kotler, Milton. (1983). *Building a neighborhood organization.* Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press.

Davidson, Jeffrey L. (1979). *Political partnerships, neighborhood residents and their council members.* Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

Fessler, Donald R. (1976). *Facilitating community change: A basic guide.* La Jolla, CA: University Associates

Flanagan, William G. (1993). *Contemporary urban sociology.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Flanigan, Ellen Deutsch, Murphy, Ruth, Peterson, Raymond, & Raymond, Alan. (1989). *If you think there's nothing something you can do about your neighborhood, read this book* (2nd ed.). In Margaret Lynn Brown (Ed.) Minneapolis, MN: Community Design Center.

Fraser, Donald M. (1993, March). *Directions framework: . . . Vision . . goals . . priorities . . strategies.* Minneapolis, MN: City of Minneapolis.

Friedman, Stephen. (1989). *City moves.* NY: McGraw Hill.

Gay, Kathlyn. (1985). *Cities under stress.* NY: Franklin Watts.

Goldstein, Benjamin, & Davis, Ross. (1977). *Neighborhoods in the urban economy. The dynamics of decline and revitalization.* Lexington, MA: Lexington Books, D.C. Heath and Company.

Gottdiener, Mark. (1987). The decline of urban politics. Political theory and the crisis with the local state. *Sage Library of Social Research.* Volume 162. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Heath, Richard. (1981). *The role of Minneapolis neighborhoods in "community partnership."* Conference of National Community Partnership on October 8, 1981. Minneapolis, MN.

Heller, K., Price, R., Ranharz, S., Riger, S., & Wandersman, A. (1984). *Psychology and community change.* Homewood, IL: Dorsey Press.

Hult, Karen M. (1984). *Institutionalizing organized citizen participation: Challenges and opportunities.* Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota, Center for Urban and Regional Affairs.

Hult, Karen M. (1984, November). Citizen participation in Minneapolis. *Cura Reporter, XIV, 5,* 1-6.

Jacobs, Jane. (1961). *The death and life of great American cities.* NY: Random House.
Jones, Delmos J. (1987). In Leith Mullings (Ed.), *Cities of the United States: Studies in urban anthropology.* (pp. 99-121). NY: Columbia University Press.

Konvitz, Josef W. (1985). *The urban millennium: The city-building process from the early middle ages to the present.* Carbondale, IL: Southern University Press.

Logan, John R., & Molotch, Harvey L. (1987). *Urban fortune, the political economy of place.* Berkely & Los Angeles, CA: University of California Press.

Lonetree, Anthony. (1996, March 16). West Side tenants forge a community within. *Minneapolis Star Tribune,* p. 1B.

Martin, Judith A., & Goodard, Antony. (1989). *Past choices/present landscapes: The impact of urban renewal on the Twin Cities.* Minneapolis, MN: Center for Urban and Regional Affairs

Miller, Zane L., & Melvin, Patricia M. (1987). *The urbanization of modern America* (2nd ed.). NY: Harcourt Brace Javanovich

Minneapolis Center for Neighborhoods. (February, 1996). *State of the Neighborhoods Address.* Minneapolis, MN: Minneapolis Center for Neighborhoods.

Minneapolis Community Development Agency. (February, 1994). *Directory of Minneapolis neighborhood groups.* Minneapolis, MN: Minneapolis Community Development Agency, Citizen Participation Department.

Minneapolis Community Development Agency. (1995). *What can the Minneapolis Community Development Agency do for you?* Minneapolis, MN: Minneapolis Community Development Agency.

Minneapolis Neighborhood Revitalization Program. (1992). *The NRP Primer.* Minneapolis, MN: Minneapolis Neighborhood Revitalization Program.

Porter, Paul R., & Sweet, David C. (Eds.). (1984). *Rebuilding America's cities.* New Brunswick, NJ: The State University Center for Urban Policy Research of New Jersey

Rapson, Rip. (1990, January). *The 20-year revitalization plan.* Minneapolis, MN: Technical Advisory Committee to the City of Minneapolis.

Schwartz, Gail Garfield. (1984). *Where's Main Street USA?* Westport, CT: ENO Foundation for Transportation, Inc.

Smith, Frederick W., & Whitehurst, Jack. (1990). *Who's organizing the Twin Cities?* Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota, Center for Urban and Regional Affairs.

Smith, Mary Lynn. (1996, February 28). Fate of Lowry Hotel tenants delay sale. *Minneapolis Star Tribune,* p. 5B.

Sternberg, Bob von, & Allen, Martha Sawyer. (1995, April 2). Community involvement. *Minneapolis Star Tribune*, p. 16A.

Teaford, Jon C. (1986). *The twentieth-century american city: Problem, promise, and reality.* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

U.S. Government Printing Office. (1976). *Characteristics of community-wide citizen involvement programs: Call for achievement.* (Booklet One). Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

U.S. Government Printing Office. (1994). *Field hearing before the subcommittee on general oversight, investigations, and the resolution of failed financial institutions of the committee on banking, finance, and urban affairs.* Serial number 103-94. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Wattenberg, Ester. (1979, January). Neighborhoods and citizen participation: A search for an effective model. *Cura Reporter, IX, 1,* 1-4.

Whitehurst, Jack, & Smith, Fred. (1988, June). Neighborhoods and City Hall in St. Paul and Minneapolis. *Cura Reporter, XVIII, 3*, 1-8.

Zimmerman, Joseph F. (1986). *Participatory democracy. Populism revived.* New York: Praeger Publishers.

Zinberg, Dorothy S. (1994, December 12). A nation in isolation. *Minneapolis Star Tribune*, p. 6A.